THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

VOL. XL. No. 235 JANUARY, 1940

Editorial

The Outlook for English Theology	*E. G. Selwyn*
Christianity and History	*E. R. Hardy, Jun.*
The Function of Cathedrals	*D. H. S. Cranage, J. M. Creed, M. H. FitzGerald, H. G. Mulliner*
Paradise Lost Without Tears	*W. R. Jarrett-Kerr*

Surveys:

Liturgy	*F. E. P. S. Langton*
France: M. Maritain	*Maurice Nédoncelle*

For full list of contents see within.

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

1s. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

33269

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester. (MSS should not exceed 4,000 words.)
Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Advisory Committee

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin.
The Rev. L. J. Collins.
The Rev. F. L. Cross, D.Phil.
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.
Ashley Sampson.

Collaborators

(The following are in general sympathy with the aims of *Theology* and are willing in various ways to give it their assistance, but they are not committed by the editorial policy in particular matters.)

Montgomery Belgion.
The Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.
Prof. T. S. R. Boase.
F. Brittain.
Leonard Browne, M.D.
Miss K. E. Chester.
Prof. A. A. Cock.
The Rev. Prof. J. M. Creed, D.D.
The Rev. F. N. Davey.
The Rev. H. S. Deighton.
E. W. Edmonds.
T. S. Eliot.
Bro. George Every, S.S.M.
The Rev. A. M. Farrer.
The Rev. S. L. Greenslade.
The Rev. Prof. L. W. Grensted, D.D.
The Rev. H. StJ. Hart.
The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood.
The Rev. Prof. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.
The Rev. Canon H. L. Hubbard.
Prof. M. V. C. Jeffreys.
The Rev. Canon W. L. Knox, B.D.
The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton.
The Very Rev. the Provost of Leicester.
C. S. Lewis.
The Rev. Prof. R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.
The Rev. Ronald Lunt.
Donald Mackinnon.
The Rev. Prof. F. S. Marsh.
The Rev. E. L. Mascall.
The Rev. Guy Mayfield.
The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.
The Rev. T. R. Milford.
J. Middleton Murry.
The Rev. Arnold Nash, M.Sc.
Joseph Needham, Sc.D.
The Rev. A. Otter.
The Rev. Prof. O. C. Quick, D.D.
The Rev. A. M. Ramsey.
The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff.
The Rev. Alan Richardson.
Michael Roberts.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St Paul's.
The Rev. George Seaver, B.D.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Sheffield.
John Short.
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.
The Rev. A. M. Stockwood.
The Rev. Prof. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D.
Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.
The Rev. Oliver Tomkins.
Miss Evelyn Underhill.
The Rev. C. D. Waddams.
Gilbert N. Walton.
The Rev. M. A. C. Warren.
Charles Williams.
The Headmaster of Winchester.

Editorial Representatives in U.S.A. (to whom MSS and communications from American writers should be sent):

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City.
The Rev. Powel M. Dawley, Ph.D., St David's Church, Roland Park, Baltimore.

Collaborators in U.S.A.:

Prof. George R. Elliott, Litt.D.
The Rev. Canon John Crocker. [S.T.D.
The Very Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbroke,
The Rev. Leicester C. Lewis, S.T.D.
The Rev. Charles W. Lowry, D.Phil.
Prof. William A. Orton.
Allen Tate.

Other Representatives Abroad:

Ireland: The Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, B.D., Trinity College, Dublin.
South Africa: The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, C.R., Rosettenville, Johannesburg.
N. India: The Rev. J. R. Peacey, Bishop's College, Calcutta.
S. India: The Rev. T. G. Stuart Smith, C.M.S., Tholashery, Tiruvalla, Travancore.
Australia: The Rev. G. Stuart Watts, 90 Pitt Street, Sydney.
Japan: The Rev. C. K. Sansbury, Central Theological College, Tokyo.
Canada: The Rev. R. K. Naylor, Diocesan Theological College, Montreal.
China: The Rev. G. F. Allen, Union Theological College, Canton.

THEOLOGY

VOL. XL JANUARY, 1940 No. 235

EDITORIAL

FEW theological books were published last year of which the judicious reviewer found himself impelled to say: "This is a book that everyone ought to read." By the injudicious that form of recommendation may be bestowed so freely as to lose its force. But we do not think that any reader will feel that he has been ill-advised if in the case of Bishop Hensley Henson's *The Church of England*[1] he takes the recommendation at its face value. It ought to be read if only because of its prose style, which, like that of Mr Eliot's *The Idea of a Christian Society*,[2] bears comparison with the English classics. Those who most dislike some of Bishop Henson's opinions may learn from him at least how better to express their own. The book is published in the "English Institutions Series." While Bishop Henson is in no way disposed to minimize or to depreciate the national character of the Church of England, he is fully aware that it is both in principle and in fact much more than an English institution. His judgment, which he makes little attempt to conceal, that under existing conditions Disestablishment will be recognized as a necessity is a consequence of this awareness. At the moment Disestablishment is even less a matter of practical politics than it was ten years ago, but is there any doubt that sooner or later it will become a burning issue? There is to-day so little understanding among Englishmen, and even among English churchmen, of all that is involved in this problem, that a book which at once informs and provokes thought on the subject deserves close attention. It is easy to make out an apparently convincing case on the one side or on the other if only one half of the relevant considerations are dwelt upon. Bishop Henson's conclusion is the more significant in that few English churchmen have had either so wide an opportunity or so persistent a determination to weigh all the facts. But before the reader accepts the conclusion he ought to compare and to contrast

[1] Cambridge University Press, 5s.

[2] Reviewed elsewhere in this number; see pp. 67ff.

what Mr Eliot says about the subject, approaching it from a different angle and taking perhaps a longer view.[1]

* * * * *

It would, however, be misleading to suggest that Bishop Henson's book is a carefully balanced argument in favour of Disestablishment. The question, as he says, forms no part of the general scheme of the book, which he describes as " neither a history of the Church of England, nor a treatise on ecclesiastical law, but a ' speculum ' or mirror in which the working institution is displayed." If interest is centred in what the Church is to-day, it is made clear at every point that what the Church is to-day can be understood only in the light of its history. It is notorious that foreigners find the Church of England an enigmatic institution. It is scarcely less enigmatic to Englishmen who try to make sense of it without regard to its history. Those outside the Church, if they know its history and feel its spell, often show a keener appreciation of its character and even a warmer attachment to it as an institution than some of its members who judge and despise it for its failure to conform to some upstart ecclesiastical fashion imported from another tradition, or improvised without any traditional reference at all. This applies only, or at any rate most conspicuously, to England itself. Elsewhere Anglican churchmen are better instructed and less prone to spend themselves in fouling their own nest. In the Church of Ireland, for instance, with which a certain type of Anglican seems almost ashamed to be associated, there is generally to be found a grateful and intelligent loyalty of a kind which in England is more often denied than affirmed. We shall not be suspected of seeking to promote an uncritical acceptance of the present condition of the Church of England. But we need constantly to remind ourselves, and maybe some of our readers too, that criticism which is not born of love and of understanding is in itself unworthy and is unlikely to serve any constructive purpose.

* * * * *

Bishop Henson is in this respect an example to us all. The mirror which he holds up to the Church of England neither distorts nor idealizes, but faithfully reveals. The candour of his utterances, even when he held high office in the Church, was often disconcerting to those who studied

[1] See *op. cit.*, Chapter III.

the virtues of caution and discretion. There is nothing now to restrain his candour but a solemn sense of responsibility to the truth. In reviewing the Church of England as a working institution, he has wisely chosen to appraise the system and its offices and not to divert attention upon the shortcomings of official persons. No one has a happier gift for doing the latter, when occasion warrants. Particular interest attaches to his reflections upon the episcopal office, upon the manner in which bishops are appointed, upon the conditions in which they are expected to live, and upon the qualifications which would entitle them to make pronouncements on doctrinal and ethical questions. It has become the fashion to call for these pronouncements, but without much regard to the kind of authority which they ought to possess. Administrative efficiency and pastoral experience are now deemed to be primary qualifications for episcopal preferment; it is seldom that these qualifications are found conjoined with theological learning.

"The age of erudite and scholarly ecclesiastics is passed," writes Bishop Henson. "It is not probable that the Anglican hierarchy will again be distinguished by the massive learning of Thirlwall and Lightfoot. The succession of episcopal historians ended with Stubbs and Creighton. The recognized qualifications for high ecclesiastical office reflect the public taste" (p. 214).

The public taste cannot have it both ways. If bishops are not to be chosen for expert knowledge of dogmatic theology or liturgy or church history, and if we desire pronouncements which are to carry more than a formal authority, there ought to be some other body to which the responsibility of preparing them is assigned. It may be remarked that Lambeth has during this century displayed, or rather concealed, increasingly curialistic tendencies, but these have not included, so far as we know, the establishment of a permanent staff of theologians.

* * * * *

The recruitment, the training and the work of the clergy and the prospects of the parochial system are topics of even wider interest and of more immediate concern to the ordinary churchman. Here there may be also an earlier prospect of carrying through reforms. The present disturbance of ecclesiastical routine, combined with the drastic emergency powers that have been vested in the bishops, may open the way to the introduction of changes that were long overdue

but in normal circumstances would have been inhibited by insuperable obstacles. But the last state may be worse than the first, if such delicate questions as that of the proper social status of the clergy under modern conditions are not frankly discussed and fearlessly answered. Bishop Henson handles these questions with a wisdom based on intimate experience and with a clear recognition of the fact that the Church is situated in a rapidly changing society. Unless there is forming in the Church a public opinion which understands what is happening, the introduction of reforms is likely to destroy what is still secure without constructing what must take its place.

* * * * *

In his discussion of the vitally important question of " National Education," Bishop Henson seems to us to accept too easily the familiar distinction between religious and other kinds of instruction. It is difficult to deny that the days of the Dual System (*i.e.*, of " Provided " and " Non-provided " schools) seem to be numbered. But we do not think that the Church ought ever to view with equanimity a divorce between the teaching of religion and the direction of a complete system of education. If the latter is secularized, it will not be redeemed by the former. This brings to a head the crucial question whether a collectivized society must not be collectively Christian if it is not to cease to be Christian altogether. Mr Eliot raises the deeper issue, although what he desiderates may appear to admit of only a remoter realization.

" In a Christian Society education must be religious, not in the sense that it will be administered by ecclesiastics, still less in the sense that it will exercise pressure, or attempt to instruct everyone in theology, but in the sense that its aims will be directed by a Christian philosophy of life. It will no longer be merely a term comprehending a variety of unrelated subjects undertaken for special purposes or none at all." (*The Idea of a Christian Society*, p. 37.)

* * * * *

Dr Selwyn's *caveat* (see pp. 12f. below) against the light-hearted advocacy of social revolution is timely. History passes a melancholy verdict on the outcome of revolutionary movements. They commonly dawn in the bright light of liberation; they commonly set in a dark night of oppression. Nevertheless, we can afford to treat revolutionary agitation,

if it be only that, with indulgence. Social revolutions are caused not by agitators, but by the forces of hunger, unrelieved unemployment and similarly desperate conditions of hardship. It is when these conditions are present and lead to social upheaval that those who are already prepared with a revolutionary policy and strategy are able to take advantage of the situation, while those who are interested in the preservation and slow reform of institutions, which have been painfully and beneficently established in the past, are liable to be taken by surprise and put on the defensive. There is unfortunately no more reason to suppose that the time of revolutions is past than the time of wars. One of the causes of the differing outlook between the older and younger theologians may be that the latter are, rightly or wrongly, inclined to accept an analysis of existing social tendencies that shows the emergence of a revolutionary situation to be probable, if not inevitable. The older, on the other hand, are inclined to hold that our inherited institutions have weathered so many storms already that there is no reason to doubt that they will be capable of weathering any that may be blowing up now. Is the former outlook alarmist, or is the latter based on a false sense of security? Time will show.

The Outlook for English Theology

THE recent articles in THEOLOGY by the Archbishop of York and Mr Mascall have this in common, that both take their cue from " a sense of divergence between older and younger theologians " which is felt to be a marked feature of our time. In the case of the Archbishop, this diagnosis leads him to the view that the philosophical expression which he and his fellow-workers in Christian Platonism have given to the Christian faith, though still formally valid, is not spiritually or emotionally satisfying to the rising generation; while Mr Mascall is led to affirm a distrust of " liberalism " and a desire to return to dogma as significant of the younger men's outlook. And he adds the postscript that the cleavage between the two ages corresponds to an actual gap in *personnel* caused by casualties in the last war. I confess that I find this clue very hard to follow. For it is difficult to argue about a gap, unless you can see what lies on both sides of it; and what I have read of the output of the younger theologians does not suggest to me any such discontinuity with the past as the Archbishop and Mr Mascall discern. That output itself is not, as Mr Mascall says, large in volume, and that is wholly to the good, for we may interpret it as meaning that the younger men are engaged on big work—in thinking, teaching and writing—which forbids much publication in the meantime. But, where such publication has taken place, though it naturally shows a difference of interest and emphasis, I cannot see that it involves a radical cleavage.

For those of us who were at Cambridge during the decade before the last war, the " habit of security " to which the Archbishop alludes was already subject to some rude shocks. On the one hand, agnosticism was militant, and no freshman could be in the University for a week without being aware of it: if he came from a Christian home and school he would soon have to give an answer for his faith. On the other hand, there came into this academic world a vigorous counter-challenge in the person, and from the lips, of Neville Figgis. The *bon causeur* from Marnhull had now become the monk from Mirfield; and he added to an unquestioned reputation as an historian and man of learning the spiritual power of a newly re-converted life. He came with the message of the Cross in his life and on his lips, and he

electrified us. In his Hulsean Lectures of 1908-9, afterwards published as *The Gospel and Human Needs*, he confronted us with the whole issue between faith and un-faith, insisted that it was moral no less than intellectual, and showed that the foundations on which Western society had been built were already deeply undermined. And his recall to the Cross as the true way of life no less than the true centre of thought filled the University church to overflowing on every Sunday that he preached.

The effect of Figgis' personality and preaching was to give a marked orientation to the thought of my generation in Cambridge. Its Evangelicalism, no less fervent than that of his contemporary, the Nonconformist divine, Dr Forsyth,[1] was bound up with an equally fervent hold upon the sacraments; and he showed us a religion that was at once vital and critical, orthodox and up to date, Catholic and non-Roman, Anglican to the core. And men found themselves impelled to a fresh study of the Bible as the story of redemption, of the Eucharist as the showing-forth of the Cross, and not least of the Church and its authority which vouched for so searching and so broad a gospel.

Mr Mascall devotes some space in his article in last month's THEOLOGY to the Liberal Catholicism which found expression in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, and says that its " distinguishing feature . . . was a break with the past." Every book has its vogue,[2] and in the case of a composite volume its different parts vary in the range and permanence of their appeal; though I should be surprised if such essays as those by Dr Taylor on " The Vindication of Religion," by Dr N. P. Williams on " The Origins of the Sacraments," and Sir Will Spens on " The Eucharist " did not prove their durability. But I cannot see in what way there was any more " break with the past " than is involved whenever new problems are faced and men are called on to give an account of their faith and hope in the categories of contemporary thought. That is no more than Origen and Athanasius sought to do in their world, Aquinas in his, the Carolines and Bishop Butler and F. D. Maurice in theirs.

[1] See the frequent allusions to Forsyth in Canon Mozley's *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (1915). [2] Though *Essays Catholic and Critical* was published over thirteen years ago, it still has a yearly sale which would normally be considered satisfactory for the *first year* of a half-guinea book. Its current sales are less than those of five years ago by about 10 per cent.

Certainly a study of these expositions and defences of the faith reveals changes of emphasis and method; but the faith did not change, and they would never have allowed that it could. And I conceive that against any of these the charge could have been brought that they "tried to build up theology entirely *de novo* upon the basis of contemporary science and philosophy": indeed, against some of them, including Aquinas, we know that such charges were brought, and were vigorously pressed.

The point is worth emphasizing, for the issue is one of cardinal importance for the future of Anglican theology. With the desire for a return to dogma I have no quarrel, and I am grateful to Mr Mascall for voicing it. Indeed, the theme deserves to be developed; for it links up Anglican theology at once with much that is going on elsewhere. One of the most striking features of the first British-German Theological Conference, held at Canterbury in 1927, was the evidence it afforded of the decisive swing-over to doctrine then going on in German Protestantism. This was true not only of men like Professor Althaus and Pastor Sasse, who were engaged in teaching doctrine, but also of such masters of New Testament scholarship as Gerhard Kittel and Karl Ludwig Schmidt. Three years later the new outlook found corporate expression in the volume of essays entitled *Mysterium Christi*. The book had both predecessors and successors; in Germany, Deissmann, Heiler, and in a different measure Otto prepared the way for it; in England Dr Rawlinson, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, and Dr Dodd were sympathetic collaborators. The movement marked both a recognition and a resolve—a recognition that the Higher Criticism, both of the Old Testament and of the New, had yielded as much as could be expected of it, and a resolve that the primary purpose of Christian theology—namely, the study of the Bible as the record of divine revelation and the repository of the truth of God's redemption of mankind—should once again occupy its true place in the life of the Church. Theology was brought back, in short, to its dogmatic and churchly tradition.

Further, an important feature of recent English theology has been the extent to which Nonconformist divines have contributed to the change of interest. Dr Dodd's name is not the only one that occurs in this connexion, though he has the special distinction of being the first non-Anglican to hold a Divinity Professorship at Cambridge, and also—

not less important—of making Cambridge theologians glad of the innovation. We need only mention Dr Vincent Taylor, Dr Micklem, Dr Newton Flew, Professor Manson as illustrations of the new interest in dogma and doctrine, in the Church, and in the Sacraments. English Nonconformity has, of course, produced many great teachers on these subjects in the past; but I cannot think that it has ever produced so many all at once, and withal so concordant in their testimony, so objective in their method. The facts, here no less than in Germany, point to the flowing of a strong tide in Protestant and Evangelical circles, and one that bids fair to go much further still.

Apart from its scientific aims, theology has three main practical functions: to fertilize preaching, to fertilize worship and prayer, and to fertilize moral and social conduct. If the first of these functions has been characteristic of Protestantism, the second has been most signally fulfilled in Catholicism. Liturgy, which is the voice of the Church in prayer, and thus the expression of that corporate worship of which the Lord's Prayer is the pattern, is almost wholly Catholic in origin and feeling, so much so as to rank with the Church's great dogmatic formulations (many of which it enshrines) as indicative of the teachings which it seals with its authority. Thus, the Churches which have kept the Catholic tradition, though they are often less alive to the ever-changing contemporary scene, yet are fundamentally more broadly based, because their spiritual life is nourished in ways of worship which have been the mainstay of countless generations of Christians in every age and clime. Moreover, the effect is to produce in these bodies a disciplined unity of faith and feeling which the indifferent cannot pass by and even the most hostile and highly organized society must take account of. This is what enabled the Church in the early centuries not only to survive persecution, but eventually to convert the Roman Empire; just as in Russia to-day it is this which is keeping Christianity alive on a large scale in face of every attempt to extirpate it. Even in Germany and Austria, where faltering leadership led to misguided compromises at first, it is to Catholicism rather than to Protestantism that we must look for the recovery of Christianity in that country.[1] In the last resort, a praying

[1] This is the conclusion I draw from a perusal of Mr Michael Power's informative book, *Religion in the Reich* (Longmans).

body is a more formidable antagonist to the powers of evil than a preaching body.

In present circumstances, when the increased mechanization of life and the growth of State organization threaten to drive all but secular interests out of men's minds, there is an inevitable tendency towards falling back on systems of religious thought and practice which seem to offer something equally radical and " totalitarian " in the realm of the spirit. It is thus that I think we may account for the vogue both of Barthianism and of Infallibilism in this country. It may seem strange to couple the two together; and yet I believe that they both spring from the same root, and that an heretical root—namely, the heresy of Monophysitism. In neither case is it a Monophysitism with regard to the Person of Christ; but it is Monophysitism in many other respects. In the case of the Roman Church, for example, we see it in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which " overthroweth the nature of a sacrament " by removing the natural reality of the elements; in the cult of the Saints, which is often carried to lengths that imply an almost divine endowment of knowledge and power after death; and in the doctrine of Infallibility itself, whether applied to the Scriptures, the Church, or the Pope, which assumes that the operation of the Holy Spirit is such as to cancel out the effects of sin and error in the hearts and minds of those whom He inspires. Through all these features of the Roman system runs the assumption that the true relation of the divine to the human, of grace to nature, is one of supersession rather than of fulfilment. Roman Catholicism is, of course, often far better than its theory; in the French Church especially we constantly find a form of Catholicism which is for the most part balanced and sane and marked by theological work of a high order; the errors of the Roman Church, indeed, seem to be mainly of Italian origin. But the Roman errors are none the less errors. And Barth's error seems to me fundamentally of the same kind. I must confess to finding Barth's teaching almost impossible to understand; and I do not find my difficulties appreciably eased by Mr Jenkins' defence of it in the December number of Theology. It suffers, I believe, from precisely the same irrationality as the doctrine of Infallibility. The truth it asserts is left *in vacuo*, unrelated to any of the ordinary operations of human thought, incapable of being criticized and therefore incapable of being understood.

But the rejection of Infallibilism, whether in its Barthian or its Roman Catholic form, does not preclude—indeed it opens the way for—a very effective conception of the authority of Scripture and of the Church. The essence of such a conception lies in the recognition of reason in relation to revelation. And reason is bound to question; it asks for credentials, and claims to relate the truths given by religion to the rest of experience and knowledge. There is nothing new in that; and if it seems to be to-day the special function of Anglican theology, this only means that Anglican theology is for the time being more Catholic than that of Rome. And it is properly called Liberal Catholicism. As Mr T. S. Eliot says:[1] "[Liberalism] is a necessary negative element; when I have said the worst of it, that worst comes only to this, that a negative element made to serve the purpose of a positive is objectionable." This last mishap seems to be what has befallen Modernism. But *abusus non tollit usum*; and the "negative element" still remains necessary, if theology is to do its proper work. It leaves us with a conception of authority more difficult, perhaps, than its rivals. But readers of von Hügel's works will not think it less true because it is difficult; and that its claims can be put shortly and persuasively has been shown in a chapter by a recent Gifford Lecturer[2] which leaves little to be desired.

I have spoken of two of theology's main functions as consisting in the fertilization of preaching and the fertilization of worship and prayer; there is yet a third function, no less important—the fertilizing of the moral life. Rarely can there have been a more widespread acknowledgment than there is to-day of the need of accepted standards of morality, both personal and public, if civilization is not to disintegrate; and it is in almost equal measure agreed that, so far at least as Europe and America are concerned, only Christianity can speak with sufficient authority to meet the case. This is the Church's greatest task; and the future of Christendom depends on how it discharges it. The present vogue of force in human affairs is the direct result of the attempt to do without religious sanctions for conduct, the logical outcome of secularism.[3] The situation is in many ways

[1] *The Idea of a Christian Society*, p. 17. [2] A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, vol. ii., c. v. [3] See an article by Lord Eustace Percy in the *Spectator*, November 17, 1939.

akin to that which confronted Christianity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and drew from a succession of divines and priests—from Hooker and Andrewes, Selden and Grotius, Jeremy Taylor and Sanderson—classical expressions of the principles of Christian morality and of their application to contemporary life.

It is impossible in the concluding pages of an article to do more than suggest how theology will respond to-day. But one or two observations may be made. In the first place, the modern theologian must begin where the great moralists of the past began, with an examination of the concept of law, and with its divisions into natural law, human law, divine law and so forth. I was delighted to read in the November issue of THEOLOGY Canon Quick's powerful vindication of the moral or "natural" law as something implanted in man by God and "re-published" —as Jeremy Taylor put it—and fertilized by the Gospel. Welcome, too, was his reminder that Christianity is a religion, not of one Testament, but of two. It is fashionable, for example, nowadays to think lightly of the Ten Commandments. But there was good sense in the old tradition which made them the starting-point of moral theology. Not only are they still strangely adaptable and to the point, if rightly interpreted; but they embody the vitally important idea of moral obligation as something imposed by the will of God Himself. Where that belief prevails, morality will be strong; where it is absent, it falters and wilts away. If theologians to-day could produce some volumes on the Ten Commandments, similar in spirit and outlook to Canon Quick's *The Doctrines of the Creed*, they would be laying our generation under debt.

And may I enter here a vigorous protest against the facile way in which the modern publicist—who is, alas, only too often a clergyman—tries to instil into the Christian public the sacred duty of "revolution"? It is a moot point whether revolutions have ever done any good which could not have been better achieved by more sober methods. But what is certain is that both war and revolution always play havoc with morality; and to suggest that, when the war is over and has left its trail of moral disorder, the Church should be incited to foment revolutions seems to me little short of disastrous. Fortunately, I believe that our countrymen, if not too good Christians, are at least too good Shakespeareans to attend overmuch to this talk. Changes

there will be in the future in our social life as changes there have always been. But to suppose that they will come best, or will be most amenable to Christian guidance, if they come on the flood-tide of " revolution " seems to me to be the very height of unwisdom.[1]

Finally, a word should be said about the form in which theology is presented. Its substance is, no doubt, primary in importance; but in this country our divines have produced so much memorable literature, and our great prose and poetry have been so steeped in Christian ideas and feelings, that we may regard this attention to form as characteristic of English divinity and one of the qualities which our countrymen expect to find in it. In endeavouring to supply this need the Church will be compelled to face the problem of the place of the classics in education; and I think that we must prepare to make far-reaching claims in this sphere. So doing, we shall serve many interests besides that of theology. Few would deny that for a flourishing theology some classical learning is a *sine qua non*; for Latin and Greek are the original languages of the great majority of its most important documents, and these cannot be properly studied without them. But that is not all that is to be said. The classics are also the seed-plot of the common culture of Europe. It is sometimes suggested or assumed that natural science, being pursued by universally accepted methods and yielding a large number of universally accepted results the whole world over, can take the place of the classics as the common bond of human culture. But the experience of the present century has shaken this belief. Men are as much impressed to-day by the limitations as by the achievements of science; they see that, while its methods yield fruitful and often most beneficial results in the knowledge and control of all things that will submit to measurement, it cannot deal with those imponderables—with love and hate, with the springs of human motive, with the sense of obligation, with the intimations and hopes of immortality—which are the foundations of men's spiritual and moral life. Science is ethically neutral; and it cannot provide the forces of direction, order, and purpose which a stable society requires. In face of such a need, Christian civilization must bring

[1] There is, of course, one kind of revolution in which the Church has a perennial interest, though it calls it by a different name; it calls it Conversion.

out its whole resources—its heritage of liberty and imagination bequeathed by Greece and its heritage of law bequeathed by Rome no less than its heritage of religion derived from Palestine. And theology will serve our generation precisely in the measure in which it represents this wholeness of outlook. It is a light which has shone brightly in the work of English divines from Bede's day to our own. The privilege of the younger generation will be to transmit its lustre undimmed.

E. G. Selwyn.

Christianity and History

I

In the last few years theologians and apologists have given increasing attention to the relation of the historical process to the Christian view of the world. A dozen years ago physical science and psychology seemed to be the chief areas of secular thought to which theology had to relate itself. They have not lost any of their importance. But the revival of the sense that we are living in a period of critical historical events has added a new element to our intellectual outlook. This is such a world, inhabited by men of such a sort; it is also a world in which such and such things happen. We feel, moreover, a real uncertainty about what is going to happen. Hence there is need for an historical faith, since we are plunged in such obscurity as to the results of our historical works—I mean, of course, our actions, not our treatises.

The student of history sometimes feels that the theological discussion of history moves among abstractions. To him, history consists of things that happen—what Alcibiades did, and all the rest of it. My hope in this article is to suggest the way that the theological discussion and the observation of history as ordinarily understood may be fitted into each other. And some consideration must also be given to what is either a stumbling-block or a signpost on the way to the formation of a Christian theory of history—the apocalyptic eschatology of the New Testament. For on the face of it every New Testament writer, from the compiler of Q

to the author of 2 Peter, clung to the belief that while past history was important, the history of this world had nearly reached its end.

Two of the essayists in the volume on *The Kingdom of God and History*, which was prepared for the Oxford Conference of 1937,[1] give us an excellent starting-point for this discussion. Professor C. H. Dodd provides a compact summary of the theory which he has presented at varying length in several publications. It falls into two parts—an interpretation of the Kingdom of God in the New Testament, and of the relation of that Kingdom to later history. I hope the following is not too rough-and-ready a summary:

> The Hebrew tradition was distinguished by its belief that God acted and would act in specific circumstances. It came to be expected that this divine action would be completed, and so the meaning of the whole made clear, in a final divine Act. In the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ that divine Act occurred. The Kingdom of God, formerly anticipated, has now entered human experience. What occurs in later history is the contact of that Kingdom with varying forms of human society, and its (at least potentially) enlarged manifestation.

In his more recent book, *History and the Gospel*, Dodd has related his view in more detail to the problems of the historical accuracy of the gospel narratives and of the character of historical existence since the resurrection. With the former we need not here be concerned at length. We may, I think, agree that it was part of the earliest tradition that our Lord and His disciples were already in the Kingdom of God, or perhaps rather that it had come upon them. This tradition is best explained by the view that in substance it represents our Lord's own conviction. But we must add the reservation that the Kingdom was still thought of predominantly as yet to come. Perhaps the phrase of the Epistle to the Hebrews—those who "tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come" (vi, 5)—is the best summary of the early Christian attitude. What in its completeness was yet to come had already been experienced in the reality of its power. In his last chapter, "The Church in History," Dodd expounds what might be called a theory of the conditional presence of the Kingdom in history. We are not concerned, as Christians, with theories of the course of secular history, past or future.

[1] Allen and Unwin (1938).

But in the life of the Church at each present moment, as it faces the world in each present crisis, the Kingdom is here:

> In the petition, " Thy Kingdom come," we bring *this* crucial moment into the context of God's redemptive action, that His purpose in it may be accomplished.[1]

We are all grateful for Dodd's interpretation of the New Testament evidence, stimulating even where we cannot entirely agree with it. We appreciate his insistence that the view of God's Kingdom we derive from New Testament study must have definite relevance to our present situation. But perhaps Dodd's very concentration on the important subject of his study has led him into a certain narrowness of outlook. I find this especially at two points. The first is the impression which he, at least, succeeds in giving, whether he intended it or not, that sacred history reached not only its climax, but its end, with the New Testament events. The Church has a history, but it seems to be merely a history of numerical growth, or at most of response to varying conditions. Surely there is more significance to what has happened since Pentecost than that. Catholics would of course maintain that the formulation of the Church's teaching has represented a fuller insight into the truth made known in Christ, while its devotional and practical life has been a permanent growth, not merely a varying manifestation. In the Church we see the continuing speech of the Word—amplifying, though not, of course, contradicting, the crucial manifestation recorded in the New Testament. But even for those who do not speak out of the Catholic tradition there should be a definite significance in Church history as history. Dodd's merits and limitations are reflected in his treatment of the eucharist. He well brings out (in the books referred to above and in his earlier *Apostolic Preaching*) its eschatological character. In the eucharist we are present at the tremendous events of which Calvary is the centre, and enjoy a foretaste of the consummation of all things. But he misses the corporate-historical element, the " communion of the Body of Christ," the saints and faithful of every age.

The second limitation is perhaps one of Dodd's subject more than of his treatment. Since he is mainly concerned

[1] *History and the Gospel*, p. 177.

with the Kingdom of God in its central manifestation, secular history is necessarily in the background. He is not engaged in discussing its meaning, if any. But he seems willing to commit himself to the proposition that secular history is "just sheer process,"[1] and that it depends on sacred history for either meaning or assurance of value. This establishes an almost complete opposition between the sacred and the secular, which would cut religion loose from vital continuity with the rest of human life, in the manner familiar to us in Barthian theology. I suspect a confusion at this point between the *presence* of meaning and the *victory* of meaning. We cannot, most Christians would to-day agree, derive assurance of the latter from the observation of secular history. But we can assure ourselves of the former.

The word "meaning," incidentally, requires careful watching in this discussion. It is used occasionally by Dodd, and more prominently by his fellow-contributor to the Oxford Conference volume, Paul Tillich. To the ordinary man life has meaning when desirable results may be attained. The "desirable results" cover all the good things of life—beef and beer, the enjoyment of art, the sense of being at home, friendship, love, and the vision of God. The word "meaning" serves as a convenient counter for a whole series of values which cannot conveniently be enumerated at every reference. Thus Tillich speaks of the Kingdom of God as ultimate meaning, and in the next sentence specifies what he is talking about as "personality, freedom, and community."[2] As a counter the word is useful. But I cannot see that the word "meaning" has itself any meaning in this discussion, except as stressing that the values of the historical process both exist and are intelligible.

Professor Tillich's approach is a useful complement to Professor Dodd's. History has a centre, or rather a central point (since the figure suggested is a measured line rather than a circle), and hence a beginning and an end. For Christians

> *Christ* is the *centre* of history, the realization of His Kingdom is the *End*, and the first expectation of the Kingdom is the *Beginning* of history.[3]

This end is not an event expected in chronological time. It is a supra-historical reality, expressed in the symbolic

[1] *History and the Gospel*, p. 167. [2] *Kingdom of God and History*, p. 115.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 111.

term of the Kingdom of God. That is the reality which gives meaning to all history. Sacred history presents us with a pattern of preparation, critical event, and reception of its benefits. This pattern is reflected in the movement of events in each age. For Tillich, for example, the Reformation is an instance of the critical event with its periods of preparation and reception. In the break-up of the liberal-capitalist order we approach another such critical event, another lesser *Kairos*, or fullness of times, in which the Church must again seek its vocation for the future.

Secular history, it is assumed, exhibits the same principles which are most clearly presented in sacred history. As the Church (in the sense of those who perceive the true meaning of existence) is the "bearer of history" *par excellence*, so other self-conscious groups, such as nations, are bearers of history, in due proportion. The tensions between the two and within each are expressed by the concept of the struggle of the divine and the demonic. The "demonic" would perhaps be more free from irrelevant connotations for English readers if we said "daimonic." It is the expression on the social scale of what we know in moral theology as "inordination." There is in human institutions and social groups enough of the divine principle of unity so that they hang together and perform creative tasks. There is also a destructive element, which leads all into opposition to God. The Church, needless to say, does not represent the divine impulse in its purity. Demonic powers have penetrated even there. But it does testify to it. In the present situation Tillich specifies three forms of the "demonic"—capitalism, nationalism, bolshevism. It is the duty of the Church to recognize the creative powers and destructive forces in each, to free itself from entanglement with any, and to prepare for its existence in a new age. Only in the super-historical, yet ever present, Kingdom of God have we the assurance that our fragmentary achievement is part of a larger, meaningful whole.[1]

Tillich starts with the interpretation of the present, as Dodd with the interpretation of the New Testament. They represent the two essential approaches which Christian thought must take in dealing with the historical problem. The richness of Tillich's thought comes from his effort to give adequate recognition to the complex factors which

[1] *Kingdom of God and History*, pp. 115-116, 132-142.

constitute the historical process as we see it to-day. Only if we look fairly at the world as it is can we know what the problems are which the Christian thinker must face. Dodd, on the other hand, has the equally necessary merit of central simplicity. His discussion of history is an extended comment on the words, " The Kingdom of God is at hand." Certainly all human life can be discussed as a commentary on those words. Each author has also the defects of his merits. Dodd assures us so firmly that one all-important event has happened that it becomes doubtful whether other things can really be said to have happened since. One might suspect him, in some of his phrases about " realized eschatology," of sharing the views of the heretics mentioned in 2 Timothy (ii, 18) who taught that the resurrection was past already. Tillich, on the other hand, is so sure that many things of importance happen that his " centre of history " sometimes seems to become more than a little obscure. Hegel and German idealism are evidently in the background of his mind, as well as Marxian dialectic. And there is an unhappy ambiguity in speaking of the Kingdom of God as " a symbolic expression of the ultimate meaning of existence."[1]

II

Tillich, with welcome frankness, announces the point of view from which his study is written. It is that of " religious socialism," a term to which he gives a more serious connotation than the vague desire for a " Better World " which it would suggest to most English-speaking Christians. The present comments are written, at least in the author's intention, in the spirit of the venerable and still lively tradition of Catholic humanism. The Catholic humanist knows that his central loyalty belongs to the Christian and Catholic tradition. But, believing in one God, the source of all good, he can, indeed must, approach with expectant interest what comes from outside that tradition or outside the technically religious sphere. He knows that within the fellowship of the Church, as in the religious practice of the individual Christian, the unique claims of God against the world are safeguarded by the ascetic life and discipline. He turns, therefore, without hesitation to see

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

what God has done in the world. In history, as in other areas of human experience, he expects to find the secular as truly the necessary basis for the sacred as it is incomplete without it.

In our ordinary observation of history we observe more than one kind of succession of events. Science, for example, is capable of continuous progress. Each new fact is added to what is already known. Each new hypothesis is recognized as superior to the one which went before, as presumably it will be inferior to the one which comes after. It is possible, of course, for knowledge to be lost, in which case we move, as it were, some steps down the ladder, or backwards on the path. An example of such a loss is the partial transmission of ancient science to the Moslem world of the Caliphate, and its still more partial transmission to the Christian world of the early Middle Ages. But in such cases nothing more is needed than recovery and the onward march can be resumed.

A far different course of events is to be observed in the history of art. The recent World's Fair in New York had exhibits of older and contemporary art, in reference to which I came on the following note in a daily paper:

> The progress of science is in a straight line upward, as may be seen in other great exhibits at the Fair. But art proceeds by ups and downs. One high point is no higher than another. The past of art is always necessary because it represents the everlasting in life when at a peak. It is never supplanted by anything that follows.[1]

Perhaps one should vary the figure, and think of art not as rising and falling, but as making successive approaches to a central reality. What has been well done cannot be superseded; but neither can it be merely repeated. Nobody can erect any more classic temples or medieval cathedrals—if for no other reason, because that has been done already. We appreciate the varying forms of beauty, the varying kinds of perception of the nature of things; but if there is any great art to be produced in the modern age it will have to be modern art.[2]

---

[1] W. R. Valentine, "Old Masters," in the rotogravure section, *New York Times*, June 18, 1939. [2] There is an interesting discussion of the history of science and art in this connexion in B. H. Streeter, *Finality in Religion*, pp. 131-176; of Streeter and others, *Adventure* (1928), pp. 156-161.

Still a different form of succession appears in the political, social, and economic sphere. If the term be understood rightly, social-political history is always a series of revolutions—that is, of reorientations and reorganizations of the life of men. Some of these are minor events, such as dynastic changes. Developments in technique, such as the commercial and industrial revolutions, have a wider significance in that the lives of many men are deeply affected. A still further broadening produces such considerable changes that the whole framework of society is altered—economic and political organization and the general tone of social life. That produces such transitions as that from feudalism to capitalism. We are apparently living now in the midst of a further transition from individualistic capitalism to some form of collectivist society—what form, remains to be seen.

It need scarcely be said that the period of violent change, if there is one, is the least significant part of one of these transitions. The process may be described in many ways. We may observe that the old ever passes away, and reflect on the vanity of human glory. We may notice that new forms of organization always appear, and think of man's indefatigable effort, which optimism easily leads us to conceive as an effort upward. Or we may concentrate on the fact of change, and form a picture of revolving world-cycles. Certainly one of the most fruitful of modern interpretations is that associated with the name of Karl Marx. The *Communist Manifesto* attempted in 1848 an analysis of the preceding major transition—that from feudalism to capitalism—and based on that a prediction of the next change which should at the same time inspire a program. We owe it to Marx that when studying a period in history, even our own, we remember to inquire what class is in major control, and what is the relation between the organization of men's work and wages and the other factors in society—religion, art, literature, and so on. There was, however, an important formal defect in the Marxian analysis, which I still believe points, in spite of efforts to repair it, to the basic limitation of the Marxian scheme. Only one more change was announced—the final shift of power to the working class, which would become the all-including group, and so the basis of a classless society. What was to happen then? Either interest would be shifted to other aspects of life besides the social-economic, a possibility contrary to

the announced theory, or else history as a series in which new events occur would be finally over. Those who have argued with orthodox Marxists of some years ago will remember that this was a real difficulty in their position. It may be put in terms suggested by our German theological friends: the end of history cannot because of that very fact be an event in history. But the pressure of events seems to have called a halt to this particular discussion.

Other areas of life might suggest other forms of succession. But I think that these three are the main types, and they do in fact correspond to the main theories of history which have been put forward. From science we derive the idea of steady progression, which has so fascinated the modern man. It is beginning to lose its bloom, but even now it is often hard, at least in America, to get rid of a secret belief that to-day must be better than yesterday, as yesterday was certainly better than the day before. The history of art is related to another idea, that of fluctuation. Things sometimes get better, and then again they get worse. As a recent writer observes, speaking of the fifteenth-century peasants whom his fantasy has transferred to the childhood of King Arthur:

> Everybody was happy. The villeins were slaves if you chose to look at it one way, but, if you chose to look at it in another, they were just the same farm labourers as starve on thirty shillings a week to-day.[1]

So the common man remembers that there have been hard times and good times; and if you tell him of the progress of science, he knows that when there was no radio he didn't miss it—still less did he miss the bombing-plane.

The political-social process suggests a variety of patterns. Since some of the changes which occur are regrettable, it may balance the scientific theory of progress with a theory of degeneration. Of this there are many classical expressions, perhaps the neatest is Horace's:

> damnosa quid non imminuit dies ?
> aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit
> nos nequiores, mox daturos,
> progeniem vitiosiorem.[2]

Or the implication of the word " revolution " may be carried out in a theory of cycles. We feel it to be natural, and rather

[1] From T. H. White, *The Sword in the Stone.* [2] *Odes*, iii, 6.

comforting, that business should be supposed to move in cycles—in addition to whatever factual arguments there may be for the theory. More grandiosely, we admire the conceptions of the rise and fall of civilizations, or even of complete repetition, which, in modern times, are associated with the names of Spengler and Nietzsche. Or the Christian, the historian, and the Marxist may join to observe a pattern of construction, decay, reconstruction. The very creation of human institutions and forms of society has always some character of imperfection, amounting to a tragic defect. Each is therefore doomed to give place to something else.[1] It would not be true in all cases to say, something better. It might be added parenthetically that while the principle of sufficient cause operates in human history, it is only the philosophy of Job's comforters which makes us think of the sufficient cause as necessarily an adequate moral justification —as in the common belief of advanced thinkers that the Russian Church must have been very wicked, since it has suffered. In private life, of two men who get drunk one may fall downstairs and break his neck while the other may get to bed safely and wake up with a headache; and there are national parallels to such events.

Can we, apart from some kind of faith, see a common order by which all history may be described? The working historian assumes that there is one, even if he regards the philosophy of history as an ornamental appendage to his subject. But his main contribution is the system of separate periods into which the exigencies of teaching history in schools divide the subject. That, as we all recognize, is one of the most misleading of generalizations. In countries where the doctrine of the Trinity has long been held there is felt to be something deeply satisfying about dividing anything into three parts. To that, I suppose, we owe the prevalent classification of history into ancient, medieval, and modern. Yet in almost every important respect the history of our western civilization falls into two, not three, divisions—the Graeco-Roman world with its collapse, and the re-articulation of civilized life which got under way somewhere about the tenth century. The University of Oxford, I believe, defines modern history as beginning about

[1] This is the scheme which Tillich is mainly concerned with; and something of the sort is at least as old as Plato and Aristotle (*Republic*, viii and *Politics*, v).

A.D. 800, which is more sensible. But how hard we sometimes find it to remember that St Thomas Aquinas had no idea he was living in the Middle Ages ! Outside our area, of course, the threefold division has little relevance. Even within it, what of the Byzantines ?

The historian finds himself, in other words, not surveying neatly laid out fields, but rather standing by the bank of a rushing stream. He may, perhaps, erect the largely negative principle that the different kinds of succession interact, but no one of them must be conceived as dominating the whole process. It would be wrong to discuss the history of science without reference to the social conditions by which the scientist was encouraged or hampered, or the general climate of ideas which gave or denied him direction for his work. It would seem, for example, that the Christian conviction of an ordered universe and the Christian tradition of concern for human welfare have something to do with the advance of scientific observation and practice in countries with a Christian background. Nor can one consider the condition of science and art as irrelevant to the discussion of social-political conditions. Yet the pattern of rectilinear motion, which presents itself as at least a possibility in the history of science, cannot be transferred to history generally. There is an interrelation, but not a complete correspondence, between the constructive moments in the political-economic succession and the great periods of science and art. But artistic achievement is as likely to come at the beginning or end of the social-political cycle as at its climax. Eighteenth-century Germany, for example, was fruitful in music, as was fifteenth-century Italy in painting; but both were remarkably fatuous in politics, and removed from the centre of economic development.

It might be argued that to ask within history for the meaning of history is a contradiction in terms, like inquiring as to the location of the universe—or asking, as I once heard of a student's doing, " Where is the space-time continuum ?" Only a position which in some way is outside history will suffice for the description of history. Most commonly the position outside will be some kind of system of values. Freedom, justice, happiness have grown, or at least been present, in the process—or we might use Tillich's triad, " personality, freedom, and community." The Marxian and the pragmatist may attempt to get away from the consideration of superhistorical values by maintaining

that goodness, beauty, etc., themselves develop in the process. But it is commonly observed, and I think correctly, that this actually merely means that what is asserted not to exist is at some point taken for granted. On the basis of values, then, the interpretation of history becomes a special form of the relation of things as they ought to be and things as they are. As a not unobservant writer added to the familiar lines about the saddest " words of tongue or pen ":

> Sadder are those we often see—
> It is, but it hadn't ought to be.

And at that point the historian must hand over his task to the philosopher and the theologian.

E. R. Hardy, Jun.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Function of Cathedrals

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Some little time ago I was appointed to a Minor Canonry at an ancient cathedral. My experience has forced me to ask certain questions which no one on the spot seems able to answer satisfactorily, and as I believe these questions are not unimportant I am venturing to ask your help.

In a really Christian country, such as England was when they were built, the function of cathedrals is obvious enough. But what is their purpose now? I do not mean to imply that they have no purpose, but I believe that the dignitaries of the Church are not asking themselves this question and that the life of the Church would benefit if they did so and found an answer. A new *raison d'être* is needed if they are to be maintained at a cost which would easily support an entire missionary diocese for each cathedral. Not only one *raison d'être* perhaps; for a cathedral in a large industrial town is very differently circumstanced from one in a small market town or a " cathedral city."

In particular, I should like to know what residentiary

canonries are for. Are they to provide diocesan officials with a stipend—the assistant bishop, the archdeacons, the diocesan missioners, etc.—or to provide opportunities for theologians to do their work in an atmosphere of worship and free from parochial cares and the distractions of the diocesan machine? There is little doubt that in practice the former reason holds the field. Perhaps it is right that it should be so. But why?

Yours, etc.,

CANONICUS MINIMUS.

[*When we received this letter from "Canonicus Minimus," we decided that it would be more satisfactory to him and also to the readers of* THEOLOGY *if we could publish answers to his questions by those who have responsible experience of the administration of cathedrals in various types of environment. We are grateful to the Dean of Norwich, Professor Creed, Canon FitzGerald and Chancellor Mulliner for responding to our request.*—ED. THEOLOGY.]

I

"Now, Dean, you are the very man I want. Couldn't you run your cathedral better with a couple of curates and no canons?" This was the question which startled me, a few months ago, from a prominent churchman. To answer it one must broaden the inquiry to ask what these great churches are really for. First and foremost they are the places where the bishop's *cathedra* is placed. The bishop must always have the first place of honour. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries he also had the chief power, but inevitably, with the bishop absent on diocesan, national, or curial business, the power was gradually transferred to the man on the spot—the dean, where the foundation was secular, and the prior in that peculiarly English institution, the monastic cathedral church. The Reformation did not alter this transfer. The Norwich statutes of James I state definitely that the bishop is to have no more power than when the church was monastic. Recent attempts to make the bishop also dean have not been very successful and are already being abandoned. The bishop, however, must have the first place of honour, and the new statutes put forth by the Cathedral Commission are emphasizing his right to summon great diocesan services. The mother church

is indeed a reality when crowds assemble for such purposes, and on other occasions, civic, commemorative, national. What other place could meet such an urgent need? What ordinand can look back without regret to two great occasions if the solemn services were not held in the mother church?

The second use is of no less importance, the continuous, reverent, and dignified worship of God. Here again origins help. Whether a church was secular or monastic, its fundamental daily object was the worship of God, carried on by a large number of secular canons or monks, assisted in the former case by many vicars choral, or priest vicars and, perhaps in a college of twelve, managed by themselves. In both cases laymen of various degrees took their part. Such corporate witness to the eternal verities was a marked feature of medieval life in collegiate as well as cathedral churches. It was reduced but by no means destroyed in the sixteenth century. The last hundred years has seen a further reduction. Now there are rarely more than four, and sometimes only three residentiary canons, and hardly any in transformed parish churches which are rightly called cathedral. Bearing all this long history in mind the question now must be faced, "Are the cathedral establishments justified in the twentieth century?" We have seen that the bishop's part in them is more important than ever. In the Middle Ages great diocesan services could not be held, through lack of transport. How about the dean and chapter? Could not the chapter be replaced by a "couple of curates"? Let us go back again for a moment. The Benedictine ideal was self-centred in so far as it was not God-centred. The Rule of St Benedict is a wonderful document, but it is concerned with the inmates of the monastery and not with the world outside. Gradually external activities were added, but the emphasis was always on the home of the monk. Compare this life with that of the friars from the thirteenth century onwards. They plunged into the world to save the bodies and souls of the people, especially the poor, the sick, the distressed. At first they hardly had a roof to shelter them, and they were never allowed technically to own any buildings. In course of time, however, grand buildings were provided for them, to a great extent on the monastic plan. Take, for example, the great Dominican church they created at Norwich. Most of it remains—a large choir for the brethren's daily services and a great nave with aisles for preaching to the lay folk. It seems to me that,

mutatis mutandis, this is the ideal that cathedral churches can now fulfil, and that neither part of it should be neglected. Three times a day, at least, the reverent worship of God is performed. What seriously minded person can do anything but rejoice when he has the opportunity to join in such services, especially when they are enriched by stately music? Precentor, organist, lay clerks, choristers form the minimum for such services, and who would not bitterly regret, be he churchman or nonconformist, if they were given up? Is it healthy, though, it may be asked, that these people should have nothing else to do but " perform " two or three times a day? The Benedictine day involved nine services, with manual and clerical work between. The whole day was mapped out in a manner now impracticable in a secular foundation. Those who take the services, however, are not encouraged to do nothing else. The vicars choral, priest vicars, and minor canons are much reduced in number. Personally I wish that the old colleges, with four or more members, had been retained. I opposed in the Church Assembly their abolition, but my brother deans of the " old foundation " said that the semi-independence had been abused, and the Assembly acted accordingly, without much thought as to how the colleges might be reformed. For good or ill the colleges have gone and the members, never more than two or three, are individually under the control of the dean and chapter. More and more they are rightly given other work, scholastic, literary, or parochial. Lay clerks frequently have some business or profession. Choristers have their school education to attend to, education which tends more and more to encroach on their choral work.

First, then, is the daily duty, as in the case of the Dominican friars, in choir and chapel. The second is preaching, regarded as more important in that Order than in any other. Preaching is a vital part of the cathedral ideal, not only at the statutory services, but at the great evening popular gatherings in the nave. What a great responsibility and privilege to preach to five hundred or more, mostly young people ! But could not all this be done by the dean and " a couple of curates " ? It can scarcely be maintained that the dean should do all the preaching. Would the great congregations be satisfied with the " curates "? They might be bishops in embryo but they could scarcely be entrusted with so large a share of responsibility. And what about outside preaching, in the diocese and in the Church

at large? The Jacobean statutes of Norwich "make entreaty . . . that the Dean and all the Prebendaries be sedulous in preaching the Word of God, in season and out of season, both in the country and especially in this Cathedral Church." The demands for such preaching are very great, demands which would not be made on the "couple of curates," demands which make it increasingly difficult for the dean and canons to fulfil the ideal of daily corporate worship.

It must be remembered that, in almost every case, one canon at least has to perform diocesan work, whether as assistant bishop or archdeacon. Then there are important domestic offices to fill, vice-dean, chancellor, treasurer, librarian. Anyone who has been a member of a chapter would know that the dean and "a couple of curates" could not combine all these offices. And what about "sacred learning"? How greatly has this been advanced by cathedral canons, who could not have done so much if they had been tied by diocesan or parochial work. I fervently wish that deans had more time for it. When I was appointed, a Fellow of my own College said to me, "Now, dean, I hope you will have more time for writing." When I explained how much administrative work fell on me, he threw up his hands and exclaimed, "You have put all your bishops into motor cars, and, if we have not got the deans, where are we?" He might have added "canons." It will be a bad day for the Church of England if the Crown and the bishops who appoint do not make some canonries available for quiet students, perhaps without popular gifts, who, while fulfilling the duty and privilege of corporate worship, will devote their lives to the cause of sacred learning.

D. H. S. Cranage.

The Deanery,
Norwich.

II

The Editor asks me for my views on cathedral establishments in general and especially in relation to learning and theology.

Headquarters is always a problem. For a considerable part of the last war I served as padre to two brigades of field artillery. My duties took me to eight different batteries

and to two brigade headquarters. I was myself attached to one of the brigade headquarters, but I was often the guest of one or another of the batteries which made up the greater part of my parish. I enjoyed my visits to the batteries. Each was a self-contained society with a proper working balance between officers and other ranks. There were batteries and batteries, but most of them functioned well and happily, and all acquitted themselves well in the day of stress. Headquarters was entirely different. Not, of course, that headquarters was one whit behind the rest in courage and morale; but whereas a battery was a society, headquarters in itself was merely an association. Everyone at headquarters had his function, from the colonel and the adjutant to the padre and the French interpreter, but these functions could only be stated in terms which went beyond headquarters itself—the batteries on the one hand, divisional and corps headquarters on the other. The staff was equally miscellaneous: a few R.E. signals, a clerk or two, a handful of mess servants and officers' batmen made a motley array with little natural cohesion. Life at headquarters was in some ways much more interesting than at a battery: you could see to some extent the working of the different units in relation to each other. There was good talk and lively discussion in the mess, with appreciably less "shop" than in most batteries. But what was lacking at headquarters and what was inescapable in the battery was the immediate consciousness of a social unity.

It has often occurred to me during the thirteen years that I have served in a cathedral as a residentiary canon that a cathedral society has merits and demerits not altogether different from those of an army headquarters. Our ancient cathedrals are churches without parishes, served by clergy who have no "cure of souls." Looked at from the local point of view this makes a difficult and not altogether satisfactory position. Particularly when the cathedral is placed in some small town, it seems too large an institution for the population, conferring no benefit to the place corresponding to its size. Not that it gives nothing; but the local activities of a dean and canons, though they are often of considerable value, are not and cannot be comparable with the normal functions of a resident clergy. This, as it seems to me, is inherent in the position. Sometimes a tendency shows itself to-day, arising no doubt from the consciousness of the local difficulties, to make the

cathedral a kind of extra local parish church. This is surely a fundamental error, only to be corrected by a clear perception of the true function of a cathedral.

The cathedral is an ecclesiastical headquarters. The functions of its ministers are partly concerned with the maintenance of Divine Service in its proper dignity at the central church of the diocese, partly also with general diocesan activities. Residentiary canonries are very often used, and perhaps increasingly so, to provide an endowment and a centre for diocesan officials. If certain safeguards are observed, this tendency does not appear to me to be bad. It is, indeed, an advantage if a chapter can retain the services of one of its members as treasurer to supervise the fabric and the precincts, if not for all his time yet for a large proportion of his time. But in general a residentiary canon, in my judgment, should have some other duties as well as his cathedral duties. For the period of his residence the cathedral should have first claim upon his time and thought. When he is not in residence it is good for him, and good for the Church, that he should have other duties to fulfil outside the cathedral. Thus I am not opposed to the practice of appointing archdeacons or suffragan bishops to one or two of the cathedral stalls.

At the same time I consider that the policy of using canonries to endow administrative officials needs to be watched. By far the most serious danger which has arisen out of the ecclesiastical changes of the last twenty years has been the rise to dominance in the Church of the administrative mind. This is a danger, because the Church is not a business concern. A certain amount of business is of necessity incidental to the functioning of the Church, and it should be done with all possible conscientiousness and care. But the real need of the Church lies in the sphere of the Spirit. Its appeal is the appeal of a given historical religion to the conscience, the mind and the heart, and this appeal must be made in the context of the ideas and beliefs of the present. Committee work can do a little, but really very little, to promote the true interests of the Christian Church. Every clergyman is bound by his vows to be a student as well as a pastor, and these two aspects of his work cohere. It should therefore be a primary function of an ecclesiastical headquarters to support from its resources clergy who are themselves especially devoted to sacred learning, and who are fitted to foster the studies and the

learning of the clergy with whom they may be brought into contact.

I may now try to state summarily what I consider to be the true purposes of a cathedral.

Like every other institution, a cathedral has a duty to the place in which it is situated. But its primary function is not local—here it differs from the parish church—but diocesan and national. If this may not be assumed at the outset, all that follows will necessarily appear unconvincing. As chief church of its diocese the cathedral should maintain with regularity and devotion, daily, weekly throughout the year, the liturgical services of the Church of England, bringing their rendering as close to perfection as human infirmity will allow. This has always been part of the English cathedral tradition, and its maintenance is more not less, valuable now than in days gone by. When the present distress is past, the cathedrals, we may hope, will still stand and will be visited again by multitudes. The multitudes should know that services of prayer and praise are steadfastly maintained. If there is a congregation, that is good; if there is not a congregation, the service should still be rendered with the same attention and care.

The cathedral clergy all take their part in the maintenance of the cathedral services, but as the cathedral is diocesan, not local, so their own activities outside the cathedral will naturally extend to the diocese. It does not seem in any way inconsistent with the idea of a cathedral that some of its canons should hold administrative office in the diocese.

But the cathedrals in the past have often—though by no means consistently—been homes of learning, thought and study. This aspect of the ideal cathedral seems to me to call for wider recognition than it now usually receives. No graver blunder could be made than to suppose that the Church can attain its true ends by the cult of mere administrative efficiency harnessed to piety. Something more is required. Each cathedral chapter, in my opinion, should include at least two clergymen whose lives are especially devoted to the fostering of those studies which every ordained clerk is required by his vows to make an integral element in his own life.

J. M. Creed.

The College,
Ely.

III

When the late Canon Barnett, after taking a party of working men round Bristol Cathedral some forty years ago, used to ask them what they thought should be done to make the work of the cathedral more effective, he almost invariably received the answer, "Abolish Canons." And it is to be feared that a similar opinion survives to-day in many quarters with regard to cathedrals in general. "Why," it is asked, "should a cathedral not be 'run' by a Dean and two curates? Is not a disproportionate amount of the Church's money being spent on the maintenance of Cathedral Chapters? Have the so-called cathedral dignitaries any real justification for their continued existence in the England of to-day?"

Behind such questions there often lies a deep-seated misunderstanding of the real functions of our cathedrals. To some people they appear to be little better than museums, or (in the words of an unfriendly critic) "dead palaces of a forgotten King." In the present age of materialism and unrest it is hard for many people to realize the main function of a cathedral. That function is the same for each and every cathedral, whether it stand in a quiet country town such as Wells or Hereford, or in a great centre of industry such as Manchester or Bristol. A cathedral stands pre-eminently as a witness against materialism. Its very stones speak to men of God. By the glories of the building, by the beauty and ordered reverence of the services, by the constant ministry of a body of men called to maintain the offering of worship within its walls, the cathedral daily recalls men's minds to a sense of spiritual realities. Its services, in their outward dignity and beauty, with all that music can furnish for their perfection, are an attempt to render to God the best that men can offer in their tribute of prayer and praise. Thus the cathedral sets a standard of worship before the diocese, not to be copied, indeed, where there are no adequate resources for anything of the kind, or where such a type of service would otherwise be out of place; but a model of what seemliness and reverence in public worship should mean. Further, the cathedral is the mother church of the diocese, the natural centre to which the individual parishes should turn, sending their representatives there for any great religious celebration,

feeling that the cathedral belongs to the diocese as a whole, that they themselves have their own part and lot in it.

I am, of course, describing an ideal which at best is very imperfectly realized. But inasmuch as the danger of materialism is peculiarly great in an industrial city, there is peculiar need in such surroundings for a cathedral's witness for truth and beauty and the fear of God. But, it will be asked, cannot that witness be maintained adequately by a Dean supported by one or two Minor Canons as his curates? That question implies that a cathedral should be " run " on the lines of a parish church. But such a view is profoundly mistaken. A cathedral in a great city draws its congregations from an immensely wide area, and their composition is constantly changing. Many people who attend its services are strangers; many more are not attached to any religious denomination, but are still inquirers after religious truth. For that reason it is not desirable that the services in a cathedral should be of an extreme type in any direction. As in a village church, though for a different cause, an appeal should not be made to any one particular variety of the religious temperament to the exclusion of others. Again, a cathedral has no facilities for carrying on the social work of a parish, and any attempt to do so would be justly resented in the parishes as an act of trespass. But even if Bristol Cathedral were to be treated as no more than a glorified parish church, the Dean would certainly need a good many more than two curates. For in such a city as Bristol the Dean is called to take a leading part in the religious and social life of the city. He ought to respond to this call, and is therefore bound to delegate much of his authority to others. It is surely well that he should have the help not merely of a couple of curates, but of several men of varied experience and aptitudes, who can divide among themselves a number of special activities. The Canons can take charge of many duties connected with the cathedral for which the Dean could not possibly find time. Someone must act as treasurer and supervise the cathedral finances. Care must be taken of the cathedral archives and the library. The Chapter must keep in touch with the lay clerks, the choristers and their parents, the vergers and other members of the cathedral staff, and to some extent, at least, with regular members of the cathedral congregation. The

cathedral graveyard must be beautified and kept in order. One member of the Chapter, at least, must maintain contact with the Cathedral School and with some of its past members. Steps must be taken to fill vacancies in Chapter livings. Adult candidates from the nave service congregation must be prepared for Confirmation. Large parties of school children and others are continually coming to the cathedral, anxious to have its beauties and its history explained to them. All this demands a considerable expenditure of time, and with regard to it the Dean cannot do more than exercise a very general supervision. Nor could he possibly find time for all the details connected with special services for which provision must continually be made—services for the police, for doctors and nurses, for the G.F.S. and Mothers' Union, the Y.M.C.A., for foreign missions, for friendly societies, the Federation of Boys' Clubs, the I.C.F., the Co-operative Society, and the like. We have had as many as sixteen such services at Bristol Cathedral in a single month. In these multifarious activities the Dean needs the help of several men of experience, who can undertake responsibility, in addition to all that can be done by the Minor Canons.

In a city such as Bristol a man ought not to be appointed to a residentiary canonry simply as a means of providing a stipend for a diocesan official. A Canon should have some distinct qualifications, if not as a scholar, at least as a preacher or teacher. For the opportunities for preaching and teaching are naturally far greater in an industrial city than in a country town. Church-people in general—and Canons among them—need to rid themselves of the notion that a clergyman is not doing his duty unless he is in a state of perpetual perspiration. Far too many sermons are preached nowadays. It is important that there should be some clergy in the position of Canons who are not compelled to preach every Sunday, and who thus have more time for preparing their sermons than the hard-pressed parish priests. The Canons ought to be able to produce thoughtful sermons and lectures such as might be helpful to an educated congregation. At Bristol, though the cathedral is geographically not well situated with regard to the residential districts, the Sunday morning congregation is one that demands a preacher's best intellectual powers. To be allowed to speak to it is a humbling opportunity. An opportunity of rather a different kind is afforded by the

nave service on Sunday evenings. That service is of a popular nature, and is attended regularly by a congregation of 800 or 900, drawn from every part of the city. The Dean bears the main responsibility for carrying on this service, but the other members of the Chapter take their share. In providing this service the cathedral plays an important part in the religious life of the city, a part which could not be taken to the same effect by a cathedral in a quiet backwater.

But apart from the cathedral services, there is work of the most varied kinds for members of a Cathedral Chapter, according to their several tastes and abilities, in such a centre as Bristol. Thus there is much to be done for students at the University and for ordination candidates. If ever a Theological Faculty should be established at the University—which is greatly to be wished—a Professorship of Divinity might well be attached to one of the canonries. Much, again, can be done by the Canons in study circles for clergy or laity, by lectures, or in encouraging religious teaching in secondary or elementary schools. It is betraying no secret to say that the Provost of Southwark, when he was Canon of Bristol, took a leading part in the production of an agreed syllabus for religious instruction in the elementary schools of the city. There are great opportunities also, of which again the Provost of Southwark made notable use, for acting in concert with the leaders of the Free Churches in such social questions as moral welfare, housing reform, the problems of unemployment, or the care of refugees. Once more, a number of people come to the cathedral at stated times to seek advice from the Dean or another member of the Chapter on spiritual or other personal matters. The Bishop naturally looks to the Dean and Canons for their assistance in the way of counsel or by serving on diocesan committees. And there are endless openings for them to help the parish clergy by taking Quiet Days or by delivering sermons or addresses in churches throughout the diocese.

As I have already said, I have been describing an ideal which can only be realized in a most imperfect measure. No single Canon can be fitted to take effective part in all the activities detailed above, and at no time can a Chapter be doing all that might be possible for its members. For Deans and Chapters share the common failings of mankind. It must be remembered, further, that the influence of a

cathedral must largely depend upon the response made by the laity to the opportunities which it affords. It is a matter for surprise that in a great city such as Bristol so few people are found to join in the devotional offering of the daily Evensong. Again, the attendance at the special Lenten Lectures, generally given by distinguished men from outside the diocese, has been far from satisfactory. Might not certain parishes give up some of their own Lenten services and encourage the members of their congregation to make use of the special help that is being offered to them at the cathedral? And more use might be made of the Chapter for study circles and lectures by the diocese at large. In these and other ways the influence of the cathedral might well be extended further. But, despite all failure to realize the ideal, I trust the above hasty sketch has shown that a cathedral has a great and essential part to play in the religious life of an industrial city, and that it can best fulfil its functions through the traditional agency of a Dean and Chapter.

Maurice H. FitzGerald.

Ankerdine,
Leigh Woods,
Bristol.

IV

The invitation to comment on the letter signed obscurely and modestly by "Canonicus Minimus" may have come to me because, possibly, I am the youngest of Residentiary Canons, having been appointed two years ago at the age of forty. My youth has been occasionally impressed on me when I have had to interview strangers on official business, and have discovered that they have afterwards telephoned mutual friends to find out whether I was really a Residentiary Canon.

I must in passing take exception to the suggestion that there was ever a time when England could fairly be described as "a really Christian country." If, as the Gospel commands us, we are to judge men by their fruits and not by their professions, I should have thought that it was clear enough to any student of history that sin has always entered in. To God belongs the judgment whether we are better or worse than our fathers.

Nor could I accept the view of "Canonicus Minimus" that these questions he raises are not being discussed by those concerned. At the jubilee of our cathedral in 1937 very eminent dignitaries preached to us about them at some length. Nor have we failed to discuss in the Chapter some of the points raised: if we have not been led into any revolutionary action, this, I am sure, is an agreeable spectacle in a hasty world.

May I discuss first the duties of a Residentiary Canon? "Canonicus Minimus" poses an either-or. Are we to be diocesan officials or theologians? The statutes of Truro Cathedral were drawn up only fifty years ago by Archbishop Benson, who came to us from a Residentiary Canonry at Lincoln and left us to be Archbishop of Canterbury. He gave much care to the drafting of the statutes, and had much in mind the customs at Lincoln. Our present statutes, issued two years ago, are based on his draft. Clearly Benson intended the cathedral duties of a Residentiary Canon to come first. We are not allowed to hold any benefice with cure of souls (except an archdeaconry). We are required to reside eight months a year, though we are "in course" for only three months. We meet weekly in Chapter to discharge the business of the cathedral and in practice share week by week the duty of attendance at services and of celebrating, while Evening Prayer is usually attended by the Canon in course. Thus we are all constantly at the cathedral. On the other hand, the Bishop may, under statute, assign to a Residentiary Canon "such duties as he may think fit in connexion with the promotion of sacred learning or religious work within the diocese, not being inconsistent with the duties prescribed by the statutes." Further, the Bishop is required to appoint each Residentiary Canon to one or at the most two of the Dignities of Sub-Dean, Precentor, Chancellor, Treasurer, and Missioner. The statutes indicate some of the wider duties which belong to these dignities. The Chancellor is associated with candidates for Holy Orders and "shall, under the direction of the Bishop, supervise the promoting of religious teaching and theological study in the diocese." The Treasurer shall "assist and encourage diocesan associations instituted for religious and charitable purposes." The Missioner shall "preach and teach, hold missions and give courses of lectures in the diocese, and labour for the conversion of unbelievers." The Sub-Dean and the Precentor, however, have no diocesan duties

attached to their Dignity: the Sub-Dean, being also Rector of Truro, has parochial duties.

It is clear that Benson sought to steer a middle course between making his Canons into theologians secluded in the cathedral and remote from life and making them into diocesan officials who occasionally have to attend the cathedral. The balance of duties here indicated may not be an easy one to keep, but it is neither impracticable nor unworthy. The emphasis clearly lies on the cathedral life and duties, while the Canon is expected to make some contribution to the life of the diocese as a whole. These wider duties doubtless include work for the Church of England as distinct from the diocese. Two of my colleagues are members of Convocation, while the Dean is occupied with being Bishop of the diocese. Possibly the pressure of Church life in its present phase of difficulty leads us to do more than our predecessors on the diocesan side as opposed to the cathedral side—to be more active than studious. I must confess that this is so in my own case, where the present phase of educational reorganization has absorbed a good deal of my time, but this is by its nature a temporary task, and with its passing in a few years' time the desirable balance of a Canon's duties ought not to be impossible. Meanwhile frequent absences from the cathedral are always unpopular with the other Canons, who are apt with moderate humour to call the offender Nelson, for does he not expect every man to do his duty?

The function of cathedrals is bound to be much influenced by geography. In a scattered rural diocese few diocesan services are possible. In a city such as Liverpool a number of special services, ecclesiastical and civil, form a valuable and exacting part of the cathedral life. In a large town a considerable Sunday congregation may be gathered from those who find their regular spiritual food in services of a cathedral character. In a small country town the cathedral should surely be more parochial. Some would protest against this, regarding a cathedral as a self-contained unit for worship and study. This view I would criticize as lacking in that pastoral and evangelical temper implicit in the Gospel. Whether it be to an eclectic congregation or to a recognized parish, a cathedral cannot escape the pastoral and missionary duty of any Christian believer and any Christian body; if it should do so, it sets no good example to the diocese. There is, further, an economic argument

which carries special weight in these days when the Church of England has neither the men nor the means to discharge to the full its duties to the nation. In Truro we have a large and inevitably expensive cathedral church and four other parish churches, not to mention mission halls, to provide for the spiritual needs of 11,000 people, a majority of whom are Methodists with their own places of worship. The cathedral itself incorporates the old parish of St Mary's; there is an aisle of the old church in the cathedral, and the Sub-Dean is always Rector of Truro. The parish itself is small. Though not all would agree with me, I judge that in view of present-day ecclesiastical finances such provision of men and churches is excessive. Were I dictator I should close some of the parish churches and give the cathedral wider parochial boundaries. This need not, I think, interfere with the efficient discharge of our diocesan duties, nor need it lessen the dignity and musical standards of our daily services, though it might help to make them acceptable to men as well as to God. The musical standards in any case require us to employ Minor Canons, or Priest Vicars as we call them, and these can well add pastoral duties to their musical devotions. True, the congregation would have a variety of preaching from the different Residentiary and Honorary Canons, but this would doubtless be edifying for them and lead them to appreciate the ethos of the Church of England. In any case a cathedral congregation, be it parochial or otherwise, needs pastoral ministrations as much as any other congregation.

Summaries are dangerous things, but I will adventure for purposes of debate on naming four functions of a cathedral:

(1) To worship God in regular services of a high standard of music and reverence.

(2) To be a school of sacred learning and a place of vision, and so to make a contribution to the life of the Church and diocese.

(3) To meet worthily the needs of the diocese and of civil bodies for special services on special occasions.

(4) To minister to a parish (in the country) or to a congregation (in a town).

It is always worth remembering that it is part of the excellence of our cathedrals that they each have their own individual ethos springing from their traditions, the needs of their locality, and the gifts and graces of the members of

their body corporate. In so large a field of opportunity as is open to a cathedral I imagine that there are none of us attached to any cathedral body who are not conscious of how much could be done and how little comparatively we achieve.

H. G. Mulliner.

Benson House,
Truro.

Paradise Lost Without Tears

A Scrutiny of Contemporary Remorse

Miss Elizabeth Bowen, in a recent review of short stories by Mr John O'Hara,[1] says of the writer: "His Roman Catholic background leaves him that sense of guilt without which emotional writing is soundless, arid and thin." Mr Howard Baker, giving us a "grand tour of fiction," American and English,[2] uses as a compliment the phrase: "Allen Tate's *The Fathers* . . . seems to be rooted in the religious view of the innate evil of man." Fifty years ago such an acceptance of a doctrine analogous to the Christian dogma of original sin would have been considered original indeed. T. E. Hulme, that champion of orthodoxy outside the Church, was the first considerable literary figure to dig up the obsolescent plant, attacking the sort of non-religious humanism which he defined as "the refusal to believe any longer in the radical imperfection of either man or nature." Mr T. S. Eliot took up the theme where Hulme had left it, and applied it at large in his criticism, starting with a tribute to Macchiavelli (in *For Lancelot Andrewes*), and developing it in his search for the diabolic influence in modern literature (in *After Strange Gods—e.g.*, "the characters themselves" of D. H. Lawrence's novels "seem to be unfurnished with even the most commonplace kind of conscience"; and later on: "I doubt whether what I am saying can convey very much to anyone for whom the doctrine of Original Sin is not a very real and tremendous thing"). Mr Michael Roberts' book on Hulme has now brought the theme before the ordinary reading public, and we can see it gradually becoming accepted in the literary world. This

[1] *Purpose*, July, 1939.

[2] *The Southern Review*, Spring, 1939.

is obviously a part of the general movement away from the optimistic liberal orthodoxy of the last century, accelerated by political and social events. There were, indeed, champions of the dogma of original sin within the Church even in the sunniest days of the Enlightenment. The flamboyant Catholicism of the late G. K. Chesterton carried it by way of ballast: " Carlyle said that men were mostly fools. Christianity, with a surer and more reverend realism, says that they are all fools. This doctrine is sometimes called the doctrine of original sin. It may also be called the doctrine of the equality of men." (From *Heretics*.) But on the whole it was not until more recent times that even the Church brought it out from the back of the shelf and dusted it up for contemporary perusal. Now we have a certain acknowledgment of it from some of the sturdiest ranks of secularism. True, it is with rather analytic and dispassionate interest that Anthony Beavis in Mr Aldous Huxley's *Eyeless in Gaza* notes the truth of St Paul's saying, " The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." But it has a connexion with his pacifism, his desire for the correspondence of means with ends (this is worked out in Mr Huxley's subsequent book of that title) and his consequent (rather apologetic) recommendation of meditation and mental prayer, the organization of what seems to be a sort of Spiritual Fitness Class. And Mr C. E. M. Joad is the latest recruit to the ranks of the puzzled penitents, conceding that intellectual weakness is not all. But, he plaintively adds, an admission of original sin is not an admission of deity: that the heart of man is desperately wicked is no proof that God exists.[1] Mr Howard Baker would agree. In the review referred to above he goes on to propose a Marxist interpretation of original sin. For Allen Tate, he says, the premiss of the innate frailty of human nature may or may not be a religious premiss. " Personally I cannot claim to proceed from the religious grounds; the question in my mind is whether or not human frailty is contradictory to modern philosophy—that is to say, contrary to the only philosophy that is available to me. I think it is not. For the opposite belief, that of innate human goodness, seems to spring from mystical transcendentalism. . . . But dialectical materialism, for instance, postulates no such innate goodness, not even the perfectability of man." He

[1] In " Notes on the Way," from *Time and Tide*, June 12 to 16, 1938. Also cf. *A Guide to Modern Wickedness*, by the same author.

quotes a passage from Engels in support of his interpretation, and so without supernatural reference he is able to conclude on an orthodox and classical note that man " must proceed with some humility to play his part in the world; his judgment must always be insecure; he needs standards against which to measure his conduct; and since standards, as Allen Tate has said, are not imperishable, he must form new ones when the old ones go, and be ready once again to revise the new ones."

Mr Joad is right, and we must be careful not to let the serpent lead us by the nose up the garden path of Eden. Is this emphasis upon man's weakness and sinfulness simply going to bring us back to the old familiar Kantian moralism from which we thought we had shaken ourselves free? True, Kant said that we ought and therefore we can, whereas original sin implies that we ought and therefore we cannot. But the difference on this level is merely that on Kant's premisses a religion was unnecessary, whereas for the modern puzzled penitent a religion must be procured to remedy man's defect. And that is not a difference in kind, for in either case the religion envisaged is a moralistic affair. The proof of this is immediately to hand in Mr Aldous Huxley's provision of a non-supernatural faith for pacifists, which is a nice period piece dating from Matthew Arnold. This faith consists in a concentration upon abstract virtues which cannot, on his metaphysic, be active in themselves, but only in the emotional reaction of the patient. In other words, here is the perfect example of a religion which is indeed what Arnold defined all religion as, a " morality touched by emotion." We can read between the lines of Mr Joad's lament, too, when he says that " a million sermons . . . a hundred pulpits " have failed to provide the " recipe for increased virtue " that the wicked world needs. And a similar moralist and homiletic conception of religion seems still to live on in other of the secularist intelligentsia. Mrs Woolf, for instance, discloses it when she recommends the outsiders to " inform themselves of the practice of that religion (*sc.* Christianity) by attending Church services; by analysing the spiritual and intellectual value of sermons; by criticizing the opinions of men whose profession is religion as freely as they would criticize the opinions of any other body of men."[1] This suggests that the reappearance of a

[1] V. Woolf, *Three Guineas*, p. 205.

belief in original sin may easily distract our attention, and lead to an ignoring of all those thunderous protests against the identification of religion with the categorical imperative which have been the especial contribution of the last fifty years: from von Hügel, Otto, Karl Barth within, much earlier from Kierkegaard half in and half out, from D. H. Lawrence right outside. Lawrence's part is not so well known, but he was like a prophet of Jehovah, rising early and protesting—rising as early as *The Rainbow* (1915), in Will Brangwen, who " did not want things to be intelligible. And he did not care about his trespasses, neither about the trespasses of his neighbour, when he was in church. Leave that care for the week-days. . . . In church he wanted a dark, nameless emotion, the emotion of all the great mysteries of the passion." And rising late, too, right at the end of his life, in a glowing review (posthumously published in 1933) of Eric Gill's *Art Nonsense, and Other Essays*: " The Catholic Church has fallen into the same disaster as the Protestant: of preaching a *moral* God, instead of Almighty God, the God of strength and glory and might and wisdom: a ' good ' God, instead of a vital and magnificent God. . . . Only in the country, among peasants, where the old ritual of the seasons lives on in its beauty, is there still some living, instinctive ' faith ' in the God of life."[1] But even Lawrence is to be passed by now, and we are to be conducted gently back via original sin to a nice moral faith which can fill up our gaps, a " recipe for increased virtue."[2]

The truth is, of course, that by a bit of slipshod thinking and careless acceptance we have been allowing ourselves to use the word " sin " equivocally, without realizing that we were doing so. Sin is always and primarily sin against God, and those to whom that means nothing would do better to invent a different word. When T. E. Hulme was willing to " swallow the sentiment " of the Middle Ages for the sake of the dogma of original sin which was then accepted, it was a particular and quite definite conception that was implied. It was no mere weakness, a sort of blotch on the surface of a self-contained, two-dimensional plane, the absence of a pigment; but sin, rebellion, the sinfulness of man considered in his position within a three-dimensional schema represented by God, the created world, and intermediary beings (such as angels). Sin was thus

[1] Quoted in *Phœnix*, p. 396. [2] Joad, *Time and Tide*, l.c.

positive and operative in more than one simple direction —the humano-centred, pragmatic direction of failure to achieve a desired object because of some mere obstinate defect in man. " That a sense of the mean, an acceptance of natural limitation, was a part of the inheritance of Jonson and his contemporaries can be demonstrated from medieval and sixteenth-century sermons and the writings of moralists."[1] But this, too, was a sense which could only have arisen within a specific religious whole, and one which could not long survive when taken out of that whole. At this period the religious structure of life was still generally accepted, but its walls were beginning to crumble. If we go further back we can see better the sort of context within which the dogma of original sin had its meaning. Some of the medieval writers surprise us by their coarseness and then by a sudden retraction of their levity and " goliardye " at the end; we wonder whether it is just a joke or a blatant piece of insincerity. If we understood the background better we should see that it was neither. As Mr C. S. Lewis describes it, " We hear the bell clang; and the children, suddenly hushed and grave, and a little frightened, troop back to their master."[2] *Back*, for all the time they have known who their real master was. Mr Lewis is talking about one example in particular in the treatise " De Arte Honeste Amandi," by one Andreas the Chaplain, which closes with an unexpected " palinode." And this recantation is startling to us after the frank worldliness of what has gone before, " where," as Andreas himself blandly admits, " the religious side of the question " is " left out for a moment." But it is only startling because we have a different conception of worldliness. " ' Worldliness ' in modern, or at least Victorian, language does not really refer to the values of eternity: it merely contrasts, inside a single world, what is considered baser—as avarice, personal ambition, and the like—with what is considered nobler, as conjugal love, learning, public service. But when Andreas talks of the *bonum in sæculo* he means what he says . . . the really good things, in a human sense, as contrasted with the really bad things: courage and courtesy and generosity, as against baseness. But, rising like a sheer cliff above and behind this humane or secular scale of values, he has

[1] L. C. Knights, *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson*, p. 192. [2] *The Allegory of Love*, pp. 36-43.

another which is not to be reconciled with it, another by whose standard there is very little to choose between the 'worldly' good and the 'worldly' bad. . . . Analogies naturally arise between them. . . . But of course there is, for Andreas, in a cool hour, no doubt as to which of the two worlds is the real one, and in this he is typical of the Middle Ages." Yet the two worlds are never simply set opposite each other, with an unbridgeable gulf between them. There is the bridge of redemption, and that is the only reason why it was possible for them to rejoice over this very dogma of original sin (this dogma that we but grudgingly admit and bewail in admitting), with the exultant paradox "o felix culpa . . . !"

Now with this insight into the medieval conception of man's limitations we can attempt an evaluation of the modern recovery of the same conception. The German novelist, Franz Kafka, will serve as a good instance, for his books are full of the sense of frustration and remorse, without any signs of being explicitly Christian. (Mr Michael Roberts, in his book on T. E. Hulme, calls this the "tragic view," and discusses Kafka and others in that connexion.) In *The Trial* the hero, K., is pursued by unknown powers, under sentence for a crime he does not understand, and burdened with a guilt which he cannot explain, culminating in an oppressive scene of mysterious accusation in a cathedral, and a final sentence of death. In *The Castle* (an earlier novel of Kafka's) the feeling is still somewhat similar, finding expression in the complaint of the hero "whatever one does, it's always wrong." (It is significant that both novels are really unfinished.) Now Kafka admits to having been strongly influenced by the Danish Christian philosopher Kierkegaard, and that is important. Kierkegaard said: "Face to face with God, man is without standards and comparisons. . . ." And even though, humanly speaking, a man honestly tries to do the will of God, before God it is all one, his atom of progress vanishes to nothing before God's holiness." But he also said: "The forgiveness of sins cannot be such that with one blow God wipes out all guilt, obliterates all its consequences. . . . No, only the man who has understood that guilt is something absolutely different and far more terrible than the consequences of sin (looked upon as misfortune, suffering), he alone repents." And, "It requires more courage to suffer than to act, more courage to forget than to remember, and

perhaps the most wonderful thing about God is that He can forget man's sins."[1] Kafka inherited the dread, the "fear and trembling," of Kierkegaard, and to that extent the feeling in his novels is certainly Christian, even though he himself was a non-Christian Jew. But his conclusion is pessimistic, and it is because he cannot see beyond the darkness of guilt to the light of forgiveness. He can understand and represent to us the evil that

> goes a good deal deeper
> Than what people call their conscience; it is just the cancer
> That eats away the self.[2]

He can state the problem, but cannot believe in the solution.

The sort of criterion we can therefore apply is one which emerges from a definition of sin as "that which calls for atonement." The little awkward tendencies to evil, dissected by any psychologist, are meaningless by themselves, insignificant except as parts of a larger whole, as surface indications of a deeper disease. "Sin was absolute and everlasting: wickedness and badness were temporary and relative."[1] But original sin is answered by atonement, and is only explained by that which abolishes it—revealed in its true meaning at the moment of its defeat. And atonement means death and resurrection. No wonder that Aldous Huxley could not understand the religious mysticism of D. H. Lawrence, could not understand his belief in the resurrection of the body. (See his Introduction to Lawrence's *Letters*.) The moralism of our religion, that fussy anthropocentrism which, if we are not careful, may be all that our rediscovery of original sin will produce, has been due in large part to a concentration on death rather than resurrection, Christocentric and especially passion-centred mysticism, which is only an intense form of humanist religiosity. "Why the memory of the wounds and the death? Surely Christ rose with healed hands and feet, sound and strong and glad? . . . But no—always the memory of the wounds, always the smell of the grave-clothes? A small thing was Resurrection, compared with the Cross and the death, in this cycle."[3] Only when man has been redeemed from the whole, original sin, can there be real meaning in forgiveness for the part, actual sins. And both redemption

[1] Kierkegaard, *Journals*, fragments 649, 606, 353. [2] T. S. Eliot, *The Family Reunion*, p. 31. [3] D. H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*.

and forgiveness come from without. If there is no such thing as "without," neither word is valid and our confusion can only be perpetuated. This is not to say that there is no encouragement to the Christian in the present atmosphere. It is much that man's weakness should be known and acknowledged, instead of being passed over by the jaunty inconsequence of liberal optimism. All this is, however, but a negative contribution to apologetic, the guarantee, at most, of question and answer being made in the same language. Yet, where all before has been unintelligibility on both sides, that negative contribution is considerable enough. We may not be able as yet to go so far as to say that faith has only to be understood to be accepted. And the indication of a defect is not in itself an indication that the defect is remediable. But the defect reveals behind it a natural desire for perfection, and "it is an axiom of Nature that natural desire cannot utterly be frustrate."[1] So that we are left with the ultimate question, but a question in a language we can now understand. "Seeing then all flesh is guilty of that for which God hath threatened eternally to punish, what possibility is there this way to be saved? There resteth, therefore, either no way unto salvation, or if any, then surely a way which is supernatural, a way which could never have entered into the heart of man as much as to conceive or imagine, if God Himself had not revealed it extraordinarily."[1]

W. R. Jarrett-Kerr.

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, I, xi, 4 and 5.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Selwyn is Dean of Winchester Cathedral; he edited Theology from its foundation in 1920 until 1933.

Dr E. R. Hardy, Jun., is Fellow, Tutor and Instructor in Ecclesiastical History at the General Theological Seminary, New York City.

Dr Cranage is Dean of Norwich Cathedral and Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury.

Dr Creed is Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Ely Cathedral.

The Rev. M. H. FitzGerald is Canon of Bristol Cathedral.

The Rev. H. G. Mulliner is Canon and Chancellor of Truro Cathedral.

The Rev. W. R. Jarrett-Kerr is Assistant Priest of St Paul's Church, Thornaby-on-Tees.

The Rev. F. E. P. S. Langton is Vicar of the Church of the Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell.

The Abbé Nédoncelle is Professor at the Collège Albert de Mun, Nogent-sur-Marne.

CORRESPONDENCE

ECCLESIASTICAL TRANSCENDENTALISM?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I am most grateful for Mr Mackinnon's instructive criticisms of my letter. To reply to them at all adequately, even were it in my power, would involve a lengthy document, partly because Mr Mackinnon's interest in, and knowledge of, the questions raised have led him to read into my letter far-reaching implications which were not intended to be there. It was as far as possible from my intention to deny prophetic vocation in the Church, or to suggest that man, *vulneratus in naturalibus*, "must first be restored to normal, and then only can be regarded as a subject for the operation of divine grace." I only meant to say that in a juster order of society the Church would have a better chance of leading men to true repentance. And indeed the proposition that the effects of the Fall must be undone in man before divine grace can operate upon him, is so monstrous a mixture of Augustine with Pelagius that I can hardly believe that Mr Mackinnon seriously meant to attribute it even to me. Surely there must be some misunderstanding here.

As to my " opposition " of the Old Testament to the New, I meant it to be strictly analogous to St Paul's opposition of the Law to the Gospel, and subject to the same qualifications. I cannot help thinking that the phrase " exegetical superficiality " is a little over-confident in this connexion, although of course Mr Mackinnon is fully entitled to prefer his own more Barthian interpretation of St Paul's thought to that of Professor Dodd, which I should myself accept. (I allude, of course, especially to Dodd's interpretation of St Paul's doctrine of " the remnant.")

On one point I feel bound to express a more serious difference of opinion. Mr Mackinnon writes that the Christian " will be concerned to admit the partial validity of the Nazi's protest against the mechanization of life, in precisely the same way as he was prepared to endorse much that the late Mr D. H. Lawrence said concerning sexual relations." Here I cannot agree. For the Nazi's protest (whatever may be said about Lawrence's) is made in the name of a natural religion, or rather nature-cult, of blood, race, and earth. The rational man, therefore, who accepts its validity, even in part, is seeking an opportunity to return to that country from whence he came out. And it is of those who do not seek that opportunity that it is written, " God is not ashamed to be called their God." That is one text on which, I think, the Church might well prophesy, rather than waste denunciation on that great moralist Kant, whom only " a remnant " (found appropriately in " the home of lost causes ") is now following. I cannot but think that, if in our scorn of Kant we ignore rights and duties in order to construct our " pattern " for society, we are in danger of prophesying very falsely. Therefore I cannot exclude teaching about the moral law (rights and duties) from the Church's function in this time of darkness. That is the central point at issue in the whole discussion.

I am,
Yours very truly,
OLIVER C. QUICK.

THE COLLEGE,
DURHAM.
December 2, 1939.

MR DEMANT AND KARL BARTH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Daniel Jenkins' article and its title " Mr Demant and Karl Barth " will wrongly give to those who have not read it the impression that my book *The Religious Prospect* was entirely devoted to a criticism of Barth's teaching which I had thought to dispose of with a flick of the hand.

The article falls into two parts. In the first (down to the bottom of p. 416) he makes the charge that I have misrepresented the teaching. From that point to the end there is an expressed disagreement with my estimate of the significance of Barth's work. In both parts Mr Jenkins gives quotations and an exposition with which I can find no fault.

I do not feel called upon to answer the second part of Mr Jenkins' case. I have after all ventured to estimate the work of other great ones, and if any disciple of Hegel or Marx or Jung, who appears to have no other background than the one master, complains of the assessment, let him take up the whole question I raise in the book and bring his master's teaching to bear upon that. This Mr Jenkins does not do. He dismisses the whole texture of my argument by reference to "neat theories." I think naturally that this is a more deplorable example of facile slickness than any of which I have been guilty with regard to Barth. How far my assessment of the significance of this theology is valid, it is for readers of my book to judge.

Now, concerning Mr Jenkins' first charge that my account of what this teaching means is irresponsible and false, there are two possible starting-points for a critical estimate of an important position. One is that of those who scent from outside that a vital new teaching will involve them in questions they do not want to face and who therefore provide themselves and their hearers with some glib caricature which can be easily brushed aside. But there is also a criticism possible when one has been gripped by and has wrestled with the force of a great teacher's work. To which of these two categories a critic belongs must be judged by the background of his mind as revealed in his expressed thought. I claim to belong to the second category, and Mr Jenkins is good enough to allow that I was able elsewhere to deal responsibly with Karl Barth's teaching. But he thinks that a few months earlier I belonged to the first category.

In his first specific charge he begins by translating a statement of mine into the kind of thing the first sort of critic might say of Barth. I had written: "*The contradiction* between God and the world disappears except as the declaration of an entirely interior and abstract act of faith." Mr Jenkins proceeds to fire off quotations from Barth in order to vindicate him against an entirely different charge—namely, that for him "the act of faith which provides *the link* between God and man is interior and abstract." It is a piece of bad luck for Mr Jenkins that the target he chose was not in the line along which he wanted to fire a charge.

In his second quotation from me his zeal has not betrayed him. He objects to my saying that in the Reformed Theology "the identity of God the Creator and Preserver and God the Redeemer and Saviour is no more than a verbal affirmation." Critics of No. 1 category have often said that Barth verbally

denies the identity, and Mr Jenkins rightly corrects. When I dared to say that in effect Barth's full treatment of this theme amounted to no more than a verbal affirmation, I implied that the affirmed identity had no content which can be recognized, even by the man who has crossed the borderline of faith. Anyone who has been through Barth's repeated repudiation of Augustine in *The Doctrine of the Word of God* and in *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, on the ground that Augustine taught that knowledge of God in redemption brings a recognition of something already known (in creation, before redemption) but forgotten, will not feel that I have made a loose statement. *Cf.* also Barth's careful and critical notes on the *analogia entis* (pp. 273 *f.*, 281 *f.*, *Doctrine of the Word of God*).

It is precisely the dialectic of the " This is Thou—This is not Thou " of the full Christian outlook which is destroyed by Barth's dismissal of the first term. Lest your readers may be misled into taking this comment of mine for " the usual English caricature " I can refer them to similar comments in, *e.g.*, T. Bohlin, *Glaube und Offenbarung* (Berlin, 1928), and Paul Tillich, " What is Wrong with the Dialectical Theology ?" (*American Journal of Religion*, April, 1935).

Thirdly, Mr Jenkins says that Barth's judgments upon conditions of society are not inconsistent with his theology, and quotes: " It is inconceivable how a form of life corresponding to this her (the Church's) form of life could not be sought in the political area as well." Now, if the most positive judgment possible which can emerge from this monumental theological discipline is a preference for democracy against dictatorship or mobocracy, it is a choice between a deplorably restricted set of alternatives selected out of those thrown up by the world. I hold, therefore, that I am justified in saying that this judgment, however valid on other grounds, is not made with a religious warrant. It is not to be forgotten that Barth found the original provocation for his theology of the sovereignty of God through his awareness of the dangers in a movement which had his first love, that of the Swiss religious socialists. To suggest that there is an echo of this early conviction in some of his most recent utterances and that this note is added to, but does not come out of, his theological voice, is not to decry the greatness of the theology. It is to acknowledge that the man is greater still. But I was dealing with the theology.

Barth was once willing that his teaching should be regarded as a " Theologie des Korrektivs." Well, as Kierkegaard said of Luther: " A corrective made into a norm, the whole is *eo ipso* confusing . . . things get worse with every generation, until in the end the corrective produces the exact opposite of what was originally intended."

V. A. Demant.

COMMENT ON THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS

THE rôle of the Church in the transformation of society is perhaps the dominant theme in the periodicals covered by this review. The September number of *Christendom*[1] contains papers read at the summer school of Catholic sociology. Dr Oldham discusses the relation of the Church to civilization to-day. Christians cannot disentangle themselves from social life, but their participation in it must always be reserved. The trouble now is that the life and thought of the individual are so determined by the society in which he lives that, unless that society is itself informed by Christian values, a man cannot remain within it and live the Christian life. Therefore the Church must work for a new Christendom in which that will be possible, and Dr Oldham suggests three means to this end. First, the Church must bear witness to the supreme worth of individuals, as created in God's image and objects of His redeeming love. Second, she must try to formulate and apply a social philosophy which is inspired by Christian values. Third, while using in her own ministries the resources of modern science, she must also warn men of its limitations. These tasks are part of the Church's work in its wider sense, which means the transformation of the common life of the world by Christian people who share it.

A more sombre view of society was taken by Fr Casserley in his paper on " Eschatology and Social Action " which appears in the same journal. He urges that the actions of both the reformer and the revolutionary are too much concerned with, and determined by, existing institutions, to enable them to give humanity a fresh start. That can only arise through the judgment of God. When God has destroyed a disordered social system, then man is called to rebuild the waste places; that is the fresh start. Fr Casserley admits that there will always be a tension in Christian thought, between this, the eschatological view of society, which sees it so disordered as to be ripe for judgment, and the reforming view, which affirms that organized society is good, in so far as it embodies natural law, and urges that the task of the Church is to make that society better. There have been, and may be again, times when the announcement of doom was the main business of the Church. Such times demand of Christians fortitude and hope.

It seems a far cry from the *Christendom* group to Mr Middleton Murry, who, in his book *The Price of Leadership*, pleads for a Christian nation, with leaders educated at the public schools. Democracy without Christianity is not worth having; and since

[1] Basil Blackwell. Quarterly. 2s.

nationalism has come to stay, let us have a Christian nationalism, of the type suggested by Coleridge or Matthew Arnold. To secure this, education must be permeated by a religious spirit, and the method of the public schools be kept to produce real leaders. In the September number of *The Month*,[1] Fr D'Arcy says that such an ideal is in some ways admirable, but that Christianity would suffer if the Church were thus merged with the State; Mr Murry is "offering the lamb to the wolf, and accompanying the sacrifice with hymns." Fr D'Arcy compares this idea of a Christian society with that outlined in Maritain's *True Humanism*. There the mistake of merging Church and State is avoided. A striking passage is quoted from the French writer:

"True religion is essentially supernatural, and, because it is supernatural, it is not a part of man, nor of the world, nor of a race, nor of a culture, nor of a civilization—it belongs to the inner life of God. It transcends all civilization and every culture: it is strictly universal."

M. Maritain traces in some detail the form of the secular Christendom of the future, which will not be simply a copy of the medieval system; it will, however, be based upon the same Christian principles, and will enable each individual to satisfy, in freedom, the deepest needs of his nature. Fr D'Arcy emphasizes the merits of this great book, but he thinks that its writer does less than justice to the Counter-Reformation. When commenting upon the changes sketched by M. Maritain, he also says—and how many readers of Maritain will be glad to hear it said—"I confess that I lag behind in my understanding of what these changes mean." Fr D'Arcy does not yet believe in that scheme of history which Maritain sets forth, and concludes with words which remind us of the eschatology of the younger members of the *Christendom* group.

"The future is sure to be unlike what we expect, and it is for each individual and every society to work as if the last day was upon it, knowing that somehow God is ever present and extending His kingdom."

Another suggestion for the improvement of society, and one that is more relevant to the present political situation than anything we have noticed so far—the eschatological view alone excepted, for that is always relevant—is developed in an article on Federal Union, by Mr Channing Pearce, in the October number of the *Hibbert Journal*.[2] Many people believe that there will be no lasting peace among nations until each is willing to surrender some measure of its own sovereignty. The policy of federal union seeks to apply this principle, as far as the democracies are concerned, by urging them to unite, not as a league

[1] Longmans, Green and Co. Monthly. 1s. [2] George Allen and Unwin. Quarterly. 2s. 6d.

of independent nations, but as a union, which has pooled its resources, and has submitted to the government of one representative assembly.

"To the tyranny of totalitarianism, the only adequate reply is the federation of the free."

The details of such a union, together with a reply to the obvious objections, may be found in Mr Clarence Streit's book, *Union Now*, on which the article in the *Hibbert* is based.

Other matters worthy of notice in the autumn periodicals, which have no direct bearing on the ideal of a Christian civilization, are:

1. The October number of the *Expository Times*[1] contains an article by the Bishop of Derby, entitled "The Faith in the Life of To-day," in which the Apostles' Creed is expounded as a summary of the Scriptural witness to God and Christ.

2. An article by the Rev. H. Davis, S.J., in the October number of the *Clergy Review*,[2] entitled "War: Christian Principles," gives a brief summary of the "common Catholic traditional teaching on war."

3. *The International Review of Missions*[3] for October makes excellent reading for those who are able to look abroad from the troubles of Europe, and consider how it fares with Christianity on the stage of this world. Most of the articles are concerned with matters which arise out of the Madras conference.

4. There is a pleasant poem, entitled "Ultimatum expires Midnight," by M. Farrow in the September number of *Christendom*. Would there were more such stuff to enliven theological magazines!

A. C. Scupholme.

---

[1] T. and T. Clark. Monthly. 10d. [2] Burns Oates and Washbourne. Monthly. 2s. [3] Oxford University Press. Quarterly. 3s.

SURVEYS

(A) LITURGY

A SURVEY of the books received during 1939 dealing with liturgy has proved difficult to attempt, for the books range from texts to ceremonial instructions via the philosophy of the liturgical movement. Very few of them are of outstanding importance, but most of them are " useful," and readers of this survey should find something to meet some particular need.

The books to be mentioned will be divided into classes, though such classification is necessarily rough and ready.

TEXTS

Western Liturgies, R. C. West (S.P.C.K., 5s.), translates into English the ordinary and canon of the Roman, Ambrosian, Gallican, Mozarabic, Sarum and Stowe missals, together with the Communion of the Sick from the lesser known texts of Deer, Dimma and Mulling. This is a useful book, though its value could have been enhanced by the inclusion of the ordinary of the Lyons Missal with its ceremonial rubrics. Further, there are certain blemishes—*e.g.*, p. 33, " In pontifical masses the blessing is given three times." That is not so; a triple sign of the cross is made and the blessing is preceded by versicles and responses. Then, again, it would have been better had a proper for one particular feast been adhered to: this would have demonstrated the different genius underlying the various rites. These criticisms are not meant to be ungenerous; they are made in the hope that a second edition may have a greater usefulness for the reader who is gently curious in liturgies.

Anglican Liturgies, edited for the Alcuin Club (O.U.P., 8s. 6d.), contains " the texts of those Anglican eucharistic liturgies which rest rather upon some synodical authority than on a particular diocesan sanction." This is a most useful compendium of texts, though one would have liked to have seen it still further enlarged by including 1549, 1552 and the first Scottish Book. A faintly tendencious atmosphere pervades this volume, which is to be deplored in what is meant to be a purely objective work. Perhaps that accounts for the omissions above cited, together with the inclusion of 1928 and the note that for " invaluable guidance on the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer the reader is directed to Dr W. H. Frere's *The Anaphora*." It is well to remember that there are other great works on this subject, nor should it be forgotten that Dr Frere's book above quoted did not emerge unscathed from the review columns of theological periodicals, English and continental. The reader's gratitude for this valuable collection would have been greater had it been possible to include some at least of the texts which rest only on

diocesan authority: these are often hard to come by in English, and it is in these fields that much interesting liturgical experiment is being undertaken.

Cranmer's First Litany, 1544, and Merbecke's Book of Common Prayer, Noted, 1550, edited by J. E. Hunt (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.), is a facsimile reproduction which will be of great interest to the student of early Anglican church music, for here can be seen exactly what Merbecke wrote. It is not without interest for the liturgical reader, since the variations to be found in the text of the Communion as printed by Merbecke show the first steps by which the 1549 Canon was broken into parts, but for the general reader the attractive biographical sketch of Merbecke will make him a real person, instead of being merely a tune.

The Orthodox Liturgy, being the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great, according to the Use of the Church of Russia (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), provides a valuable and convenient volume for those who have occasion to assist at the Orthodox Liturgy. The translators are to be congratulated on the beauty of the English and on its sensible and clear arrangement, which makes it possible to follow easily what to the ordinary person is a complicated and unfamiliar service. I put this volume to a practical test, for finding myself unexpectedly responsible for the incense at a Liturgy, produced it at the right places ! The addition of the beautiful prayers of the Office of Preparation for Holy Communion makes this book of use for private devotion.

Venite Adoremus, 2 vols. (World's Student Christian Federation, Geneva, 4s.). It is to be hoped that the present situation will not hinder this work from receiving the attention due to it. This book must help on the work of reunion, for it makes available the riches of liturgical devotion of varying traditions. It is also a witness to the desire of students to share these traditions and to build their worship on a liturgical basis. The first volume contains in English, French and German the non-services of the French Reformed Church, the Church of Sweden (Missa Catechumenorum), Matins and Evensong of the Church of England, Orthodox Easter Vespers and Compline from the Benedictine Breviary. The general introduction and the explanations prefixed to each service are perhaps the most valuable parts of a notable volume.

The second volume contains materials and skeleton forms for special occasions. Much profitable use could be made of this material for guilds and for other informal services. But, please, will all those who undertake such informal services read most carefully the section entitled " Elementary practical notes for leaders of services."

The exclusion of all eucharistic prayer is sad, but it at least marks the measure of our disunion realistically and should have the effect of making prayer for complete reunion more sincere. Too often one prays only for reunion of an incomplete sort

according to one's own ecclesiastical temper. In these volumes something of the riches of worship Catholic and Protestant is markedly displayed.

Eucharistic Prayers from the Ancient Liturgies, chosen and arranged by Evelyn Underhill (Longmans, 2s. 6d.). A very valuable collection of prayers for Holy Communion carefully chosen by an acknowledged authority on prayer. Eucharistic manuals have for generations played a great part in the spiritual life of members of the Church of England, but in nearly all there has been too great an emphasis on the personal aspect of Holy Communion. The word " I " has figured overmuch both in preparation and thanksgiving. Here are prayers taken from liturgical sources which will help to emphasize the corporate aspect and will have a valuable corrective influence in the lives of many regular communicants. It would make a fine confirmation present for adult educated candidates, and can be recommended in the case of persons who want a change of their book of devotion. It can be used at home and in church during the service.

The Prayer Book Psalter Revised, by Professor G. A. Cooke (O.U.P., 8s. 6d.). The task of surveying this book on the technical side of questions of the Hebrew text and accurate translations is outside the scope of this survey. That there are obvious difficulties and inaccuracies in the Prayer Book Psalter is known to everyone, and everyone agrees that in the interest of truth there must be a new version. Dr Cooke offers this version as a contribution towards the material from which some future text may be prepared. He has taken into full account that the psalms are to be said or sung in divine worship and has always weighed his words against the chant pointing and speech rhythm. He has to a large extent succeeded in producing a translation that can be sung—but in spite of all that will be gained by having a more accurate and less anachronistic version the surveyor hopes that he will be buried before a revised funeral office declares " like the grass which bloometh in the morning: and in the evening is withered and dried," or " for by thy wrath all our days decline: and we bring our years to an end like a murmur."

A second category can be made of books which deal with the explanation of liturgical formulæ.

De Breviarii Romana Liturgica, by C. Callewaert (J. C. D. Beyaert, Bruges, 40 frs.). A second edition of a work appearing in 1931 in the series of *Liturgicæ Institutiones*, intended for senior seminarians. The author is a distinguished practical liturgist who takes account of the history of the text and ceremonial rubrics and adds valuable technical explanations of the rules governing the recitation of the Breviary. The book exhibits in its careful attention to method and logical arrangement some of the best features of Roman Catholic scholarship.

The Church's Daily Prayer, by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 5s.), is another attractive Roman Catholic work which deals with the Breviary, written for the devout lay person. This is a scholarly *œuvre de vulgarisation* which contains far more than a popular history of the growth and explanation of the Breviary. The introduction on the purpose and meaning of liturgical prayer and its peculiar qualities has a freshness and point which all the books based on the liturgical movement do not have. Perhaps this is because the author is first of all an historian.

The next book on the list, *The Church's Prayers*, by H. de Candole (Mowbray, 1s. 6d.), also deals with non-eucharistic worship, which is a significant pointer towards a greater understanding that Christians should be encouraged to worship at other services besides the Mass. Fr de Candole has produced a small but most important book for members of the Church of England, for it must never be forgotten that many Anglican congregations have for their most largely attended services Matins and Evensong, and that there is a very long and deep spiritual life behind this tradition.

The trouble too often is that either the clergy of such parishes regard the choir offices as liturgical and the congregation think of them as popular services, or that, particularly in rural areas, the congregation have a deep but undefined understanding of the corporate importance of these services while the clergy regard them as popular services and adapt them too freely. Here is a book, then, which will help some clergy to teach clearly the liturgical corporate purpose of the "ordinary service" to congregations who think them popular but dull services and will restrain other clergy from destroying the corporate sense of Matins and Evensong in congregations which already have this tradition. Too many clergy regard very lightly the obligation of saying Matins and Evensong, and this book will help them intelligently to fulfil this duty.

Worship in Church, a series of pamphlets (Heffer, Cambridge, 1d. each), also deals with morning and evening prayer, though a future series is planned which is to include Holy Communion. The aim of the series is to promote "a better understanding of, and a deeper reality in, the services of the Church." They are well worth a place in the tract case of a church: they are simply and clearly written.

The Year's Liturgy, vol. i, by Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 7s. 6d.), is written to help to a better understanding of the Church year. The author gives a short account of the growth of the seasons and feasts, and expands the lessons to be learned from them by reference to the variable parts of the Roman Mass. It would be presumptuous to praise its scholarship. For many people the comparative fewness of special collects, epistles and gospels in the English Church

turns their minds enviously to the Roman Missal. In this volume its riches and great variety are well brought out. This book should help greatly those who do not share this desire to understand sympathetically the desire of those who aim at greater variation and enrichment of the Anglican service book.

Liturgical Asides, by H. van Zeller (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 3s. 6d.), is a collection of meditations and reflections based on the Roman Missal.

Books dealing with the "Liturgical Movement"

The Liturgy, papers read at the Priests' Convention, Tewkesbury, May, 1938, edited by the Bishop of Brechin (S.P.C.K., 4s.). This is a real contribution towards the promotion of an understanding of the liturgical movement within the Anglican Church. In a symposium it is only natural that some papers should be of greater merit than others, and though the writers were given a syllabus for the convention, each writer approached it from his own point of view. I would single out for special mention the following papers: "Salvation," by W. G. Peck; "Consecration," by Fr Gregory Dix, O.S.B., which, though treated entirely along historical lines, is magnificent if not "liturgical"; and "Communion," by Canon C. Smyth, which again is treated from an historical side.

The Splendour of the Liturgy, by Maurice Zundel (Sheed and Ward, 7s. 6d.), should be read by all those who want to understand how the liturgical movement is being used to promote a school of spirituality. With this book should be read *Liturgy and Life*, by Th. Wesseling, O.S.B. (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), which bases a philosophy of life on the liturgy. This is the most important and original work of those under review. It sets forth a view of life which is totalitarian in the best sense of the word. Traditional Catholic theology and philosophy have not so far been able to make the doctrine of the solidarity of the human race so living a force as to prevent war and injustice. It may well be that this great doctrine may be better emphasized in this liturgical view of life. Unfortunately the author has a difficult and involved style which at times spoils his book. Sociology and the philosophy expounded by the liturgical movement have much in common and are playing an increasing part in Christian thought. Much of the energy underlying the liturgical movement has been diverted into a new campaign of "mass millinery" and of new fashions in "short, square and brutish" ornaments: on the Continent the questions of the vernacular and, in quiet corners, the discussion of the restoration of the Cup to the laity have tended to disguise its more fundamental aims. Here in this book the fundamental ideas of the movement are expounded.

Ceremonial

Public Worship according to the Use of the Church of Ireland, by C. Chavasse (Dungalgan Press, Dundalk, 2s.), is a directory of ceremonial adhering carefully to the Irish Prayer Book and Canons. It is chiefly of local value, but most priests could learn something from it in the orderly conduct of divine worship. It is unfortunate that ceremonial and the insistence on ordered ways should have become identified with one school of thought, and it ought not to be so. The reasonableness of this book should help to destroy any idea that it is necessarily so. The opening sentence of the chapter on Holy Matrimony—" It would be a good thing if there were more public baptisms and fewer public marriages "—will show that this book is not concerned with the minutiæ of ceremonial. An attack on fasting communion deserves to be read; for those who defend it, as I should do myself, would see the position of those who, while valuing its spiritual worth, think that more has been lost than gained by its revival.

Eucharistic Ceremonial in One-Priest Parishes (Alcuin Leaflets No. 8, 2d.). This gives in simple language and decent English a clear idea of the conduct of the Eucharist following 1662 based in other respects on the " most authentic traditions of the Church of England."

The Liturgical Altar (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 3s. 6d.) is a revised edition of Mr. Webb's earlier work. Architects who design new altars would help the devotion and save the tempers of many priests if they would read this book.

Such are the books which have been received this year. Their number and diversity demonstrate the interest in liturgiology, the liturgical movement and allied subjects.

F. E. P. S. Langton.

(B) M. MARITAIN: A MODERN DISCIPLE OF AQUINAS

" The trend of modern intellects is against us."[1] Such a remark reminds me of a saying of Algar Thorold, the late editor of the *Dublin Review*. In a letter about A. N. Whitehead, he observed that contemporary thinkers do not care for a transcendental Reality: even if they seem to acknowledge its existence, he went on, they envelop it in some worldly process and they submit it to relativity or dependence.

[1] *Les Degrès du Savoir*, p. 7.

Maritain adds: " A slope is made to be climbed." That is an optimistic view. In the event, he has been right in taking it; for, on the whole, our modern world has received his anti-modern philosophy kindly. His influence has proved to be powerful in the very countries where relativism was most often advocated—I mean, in Germany and Great Britain. It is, for instance, significant that his work had an effect on the intellectual development of such a writer as Miss Evelyn Underhill. Her interest in mysticism originated in Bergson's philosophy of life; but she found her true inspirers in medieval theology, the exposition of which by Maritain was, curiously enough, one of her chief motives in becoming an Anglo-Catholic. Shall I quote another example of the same stimulating power? The refined French critic the late Charles du Bos, on the day of his conversion to Catholicism, addressed these simple words to Jacques Maritain: " I come to you because I am quite different from you: my mental horizon is opposed to yours."

No doubt, much attention is paid in every quarter to the prolific output of Maritain; he has many supporters and admirers. His first books seemed to be negative. He did not start from a thesis, but from an antithesis; he was never perplexed by uncertainty, and he ignored the art of compromise. He courageously smashed the intellectual idols of his age with a literary skill that may not be underrated. As a young Elisha, he inherited Elijah's mantle: the polemical talent of Léon Bloy. It was the time when the first edition of *La Philosophie bergsonienne* was published, shortly followed by *Theonas* and *Antimoderne*. But this aggressive spurt was already combined with an affirmative and creative effort. He hated equivocations and softness, because he wanted to be himself. Up to a point, harshness is the attribute of youth, even in spiritual history. He introduced himself as a crusader, seeking redress; and I shall not deny that, in spite of his claims to justice, he was unjust to some of his adversaries. Since then, years have rolled by, and he has learned a maturer wisdom; he is now free from his former excesses. The second and new edition of *La Philosophie bergsonienne* no longer contains the bitter phrases that unquestionably grieved a candid reader. A few months ago Maritain was invited to broadcast a lecture on Descartes, on the occasion of the tercentenary of the *Discours de la méthode*: he succeeded in giving an admirable sketch of it, and he spoke of his enemy with a perfect mixture of objective serenity and original boldness.

I shall therefore leave Maritain's polemical writings to his philosophical childhood. Polemics had and have still an important place in the economy of his thought but cannot give us precise information concerning this thought itself. You cannot guess what a man is able to construct when you know only what he has demolished.

Maritain has partly published a course of philosophy: a

textbook of *Logic*, still in progress,[1] some *Leçons sur l'Etre* and *La Philosophie de la Nature*. We have to wait for the complete set of volumes. Meanwhile, the best synthesis of his views is certainly to be found in *Les Degrès du savoir*, reissued in 1935. We may, therefore, dwell upon it at greater length.

First of all, the relation of metaphysics and experimental science is examined. Maritain considers that metaphysical knowledge is of no use to experimental inquiry (p. 8). "The phenomenal sciences have exempted metaphysics from the task of explaining perceptible things in Nature and made impossible such delusions as ensued for Greek optimism" (p. 31). But is there room for intelligible Nature, the knowledge of which would lie between ontology proper and physical science? Maritain answers in the affirmative. The Philosophy of Nature is, to him, perfectly valid; its true object is to establish first principles, and to disentangle ultimate roots, "in the line of corporeal nature" (p. 93). This is a *questio vexata*. Amongst the scholastics themselves, it must be confessed that deep divergences appeared in the Louvain Congress of 1935 on *La Philosophie et les sciences*.

Maritain will be exposed, of course, to a double series of attacks. First, what real new conclusions can be reached by philosophers about the nature of matter, when physicists have stated what they know? Secondly, is it wise to deny philosophical value to physical science? Both objections are discussed on pp. 360-62 and elsewhere. The physico-mathematical synthesis of Einstein is only an image of this world, according to Maritain: it has no real and philosophical import as a theory. Bergson was formerly of a similar opinion, so that, by a quite extraordinary exception to their general disagreement, the two thinkers passed the same sentence on Einstein.[2] Afterwards, Bergson wrote *La Pensée et le mouvant*, in which he maintains that we have no reason to think that the scientific knowledge of matter is not an absolute knowledge. Such generosity would be called simply "obsolete" by Maritain (p. 312). He is, therefore, quite alone now.

He makes a stand, however, quite bravely. He views the connexion between the two realms of science and philosophy as a dependence of the first on the second—an obscure, unavowed, unpleasing and cross-dependence (*oblique*), so to speak (p. 311). Dropping the apology, he becomes defiant: science, he says, has to be delivered from the iron collar of modern metaphysics (p. 131). This is good humour, directed to some ignorant despisers of medieval philosophy.

As to mathematics, it is, we are told, an instrumental language

[1] This book would require a special article; I regret that I have to leave it on one side in this more general survey. [2] This *entente cordiale* was soon impaired. See *Réflexions sur l'intelligence*, Paris, 1924, p. 346.

of physics, somehow " præter-real " (p. 318). It has an intuitive, imaginative ground, out of which axioms are extracted and systematically combined. This account of mathematical intuition, I am sorry to say, remains rather a mystery to me. I am afraid the word *intuition* is subservient to several very different aims. Here is an example: " Some systems of geometrical entities are called Euclidian space, Riemannian space, etc. . . . Now, tridimensional Euclidian space alone can be directly built on intuition " (p. 331). Moreover, mathematics seems to be conceived as akin to reality when it is elementary and poor; all its more complex structure and richness would be of a merely fictitious character. If so, I cannot understand its extraordinary growth in modern science; neither do I understand that its standard of being would be founded *in re*, as we are told it is.

Whatever may be said on that special problem, the Philosophy of Nature, according to Maritain, is neither metaphysical nor scientific, but situated in a region of intelligibility that requires sensible existence. Maritain distinguishes many such regions. Probably he will try to connect them more closely in the future. Possibly he will make use of biology for this purpose. He has but a few pages on biology. As might be expected, he clings to the hylomorphic conceptions of Aquinas; but the distinction he draws between philosophy and experience seems to be particularly thin and frail in this new sphere. Anyhow, he prophesies that the science of life will prove a stumbling-block to mechanistic theories and will break down their narrow limitations, just as the Greek Scheme of Nature came to a deadlock when modern physics arose (p. 92).

* * * * *

Beyond the *scientia media* or indirect knowledge of phenomena through mathematics, beyond the Philosophy of Nature (so mysterious to me), Maritain conceives general metaphysics as a world of Being, quiddities and transcendental objects. He takes his stand upon the Thomistic theory of analogy. He makes it a citadel and keeps the nominalist assailants off. Analogy is, no doubt, a masterpiece of St Thomas's work, and may be rightly insisted on.

Nevertheless, Maritain will be discussed again. Many contemporary thinkers consider that an exploration of being *qua* being is a thorough-going *petitio principii*. I do not see that an understanding can be arrived at between Maritain and them. They are, in his opinion, a positive scandal to every sound intellectualist; and he is certainly judged by them as a day-dreamer, comfortably resting on his set of postulates. Either you trust in Being or not. It may be observed, at least, that Maritain has not yielded to the Jansenist temptation of decrying human reason, in spite of the fact that modern philosophers so widely differ from him.

Others may be suspicious of the abundance and conceptual richness of the book. One of them gave me his impression in the following whimsical terms: " Here is a man who is certainly convinced he has obtained Truth by parcel post." I should reply that the bold omniscience of Maritain is only superficial. He is, quite often, unpretentious, and he dislikes the idea of " system " either for St Thomas or himself (p. xv). He has a keen desire for real concrete knowledge; he is aware of a pluralistic universe, and he thinks that his own job is to do his best to grasp the mystery of it.

Moreover, metaphysics, though leading to the knowledge of God, is not, for him, the supreme mode of intimacy with God. " Deity is above the realm circumscribed by the idea of being; the idea of being, if it stood by itself as a Platonic archetype, would still be infinitely beneath God " (p. 451). " Saints do not contemplate in order to know, but to love. And they do not love in order to love, but for the sake of Him whom they love " (p. 21). Therefore, a big portion of the book is devoted to the study of mystical experience, and more especially to St John of the Cross. But how shall I sum up or criticize it ? The reader had better go to the source and quench his thirst therein. Such pages are so full of meaning and so faultless that I shall not pull them to pieces, even by giving a quotation.

Of course, some technical points could be disputed. Maritain sees more continuity than I should do between St Augustine and St Thomas (p. 604).[1] He thinks, too, that St John of the Cross and St Thomas are always perfectly attuned to each other, though St John of the Cross does not care for ontological research, which may be doubted in some measure.

* * * * *

Maritain himself is not a mere speculative thinker. He has published many pamphlets on Christian morals. This part of his work absorbs his time and energy more and more, but there is no intrinsic connexion between his metaphysical creed and his political tendencies (or, *a fortiori*, his literary and artistic preferences).

The best book of this series is *Humanisme intégral*; it is a sure guide in our civic perplexities. I do not know of another Catholic philosopher in our country who writes in such a balanced manner, both free and wise in his statements. I shall not dwell any longer upon this aspect, since a review of this book has already appeared in THEOLOGY (January, 1939).

The most valuable aspect of Maritain's work is to be seen,

[1] A rudimentary discrimination of essence and existence *in creatis*, and the assertion of their identity in God alone, are detected by Maritain in *De Civit. Dei*, Bk. XI. I think there is another clue in *Confess.*, Bk. I., ch. vi., § 3, where *esse* and *vivere* are distinguished.

I think, in his critical realism. He has a feeling for the immense variety of the Universe, and pays respectful attention to the humblest forms of being as so many ways to God.

The average reader of Maritain does not know what Thomism is; he is not very keen on the mysteries of the *Ens in quantum est ens*. But he finds many an illuminating page on the life of man in God and the action of man for God. Charity is the theological virtue that inspires and unifies the entire work. It is the keystone that binds together the diversified whole. No better guarantee can be found for a Christian philosopher, when he is, at the same time, a clear-headed and orderly thinker.

Maurice Nédoncelle.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE IDEA OF A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY. By T. S. Eliot. Faber. 5s.

This is perhaps Mr Eliot's most satisfactory piece of prose. No doubt his invariable aim in all that he had published before was to put the reader directly in touch with his thought. But the result was often to irritate and even to alienate some readers, who felt that he was adopting an oracular, not to say a didactic, manner. Here no feeling of that kind is possible. The style has attained a ripeness and simplicity thanks to which the matter is really left stark. To a great extent this may be because no matter could better bear exposure. Seldom nowadays is there found in as few pages so much admirably formulated wisdom.

The new *dépouillement* of the style is not the less remarkable for having occurred in the absence of any change in the way the writer *treats* his matter. Change in that respect was not to be expected; for the treatment is *l'homme même*. If we ask ourselves how there can have been the delusion in some quarters that Mr Eliot looks upon himself as an oracle and wishes to lay down the law when actually he seeks but to diagnose the facts as tersely as possible, we see that it is because he never argues; he merely asserts. That is all he does here. Argument is not his line. Where by chance he happens to draw an inference, he is apt to perpetrate a fallacy. For instance, he says (p. 20): "You have only to examine the mass of newspaper leading articles, the mass of political exhortation, to appreciate the fact that good prose cannot be written by people without convictions." Normally his essays are the product, not of an emotional impulse and still less of conscious ratiocination, but of the practical judgment. That is to say, he sets down decisions which he has been led to take thanks to his experience of living. In his own words, he is to be judged by his "total harvest of thinking, feeling, living and observing human beings." Hence for him to put these decisions into argumentative and persuasive form would be to explain how they have been reached. The task is extremely arduous and difficult, and at best the explanation remains partial. In a book published some years ago, the economist Mr R. G. Hawtrey remarked:

> "The practical judgment is partly sub-conscious, and, in so far as it is conscious, its mental processes are not *linguistic*. To express in language even the decision itself is an effort; to express the grounds on which it is taken would often be a formidable exercise in psychology and literary composition. And when it had been done with the highest skill and sincerity, the result would probably be only a partial and inaccurate account at the best."

Inevitably this restricts the appeal of the book. Mr Eliot's thesis is that societies are constantly changing, that our present

society is in a liberalized or negative condition, and that it will either go into a gradual decline of which no end can be seen, or else reform itself into a positively secular shape—unless instead it is made Christian. And, since change there must be, he of course considers that for it to be made Christian is preferable. But those persons who feel that society to-day, when it has largely abandoned Christianity, is a kinder and more comfortable society—notwithstanding 1,400,000 registered unemployed—than it was when it was ostensibly Christian under the Plantagenets or the Tudors, for example, will not be led to alter their opinion by anything in these pages. Certainly the case for a Christian society is not strengthened by Mr Eliot's unintelligible use of the term "bad" when he says that a Christian attitude is not required in order to see that much in contemporary society is "inherently bad." But he must not be asked for more than he offers. The book, he says, "can only be of use if taken as an original contribution to a discussion which must occupy many minds for a long time to come."

Even within these limits he is open to the reproach of not having quite made up his mind whether he wished to write of an ideal Christian society or of the extent to which our English society might become Christian once again. His proposed "Community of Christians" as the centre of faith in action belongs to the realm of the ideal. For the most part, it is true, he confines himself to a transformation that may be feasible; but not only does he never refer to previous Christian societies, he likewise utters no word regarding any in existence now. Yet if we are to set about making our own society Christian, it will surely be of advantage to consider how an actual Christian society is possible to-day in, say, Alsace.

A number of points of detail might be criticized. I shall mention only two. In fancying that "pacifism can only continue to flourish so long as the majority of persons forming a society are not pacifists," Mr Eliot exaggerates the positive potentialities of negation, apart from completely misunderstanding pacifism. In deploring "the Liberal notion of religion" and "universal toleration" he neglects to reckon with the consequences of Empire. There is a legend to the effect that Napoleon became a Moslem while in Egypt; and it is difficult to see how, in the absence of toleration, the King of England could also be Emperor of India.

These are small matters in comparison with the abundance of admirably formulated wisdom of which I have spoken. If Mr Eliot could command the immediate assent of everybody when he refers to the drawbacks of toleration, to Establishment and Disestablishment, to the nature of the problem of leading a Christian life in a non-Christian society, to what determines the behaviour of politicians, to the shadowiness of the issue between "democracy" and totalitarianism, to propaganda and

the furious efforts of the nations at present to export their "culture" although each has less and less culture for its own consumption, and to much else, his dicta would doubtless be trite. But many of us will come to see that he is right if we first go on our own account in quest of the grounds for the conclusions he puts forward. That is what I mean by wisdom.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

Professor Baillie's latest book resembles in many ways his earlier volume, *And the Life Everlasting*. There is the same breadth of scholarship and clarity of argument. Once again the author takes his stand on the facts of our experience; "proofs" of God's existence he finds no more satisfying than "proofs" of immortality.

There are three propositions in his central thesis. He holds, first, that we do not come to know God by any process of logical argument; second, that God is known to us by "direct confrontation"; and third, that this ability to be directly confronted by Him is essential to human nature.

Chapter I is mainly concerned with the third of these propositions. In its defence he joins battle with Dr Barth and Dr Brunner; or rather, he allows these two to fight it out, and presents us with the truth that has emerged. On the whole his sympathies are with Dr Brunner, though he cannot follow him in his distinctions between the *form* and the *matter* of the image of God, and between *saving* and *sustaining* grace. This part of the book may well be its most interesting feature to many readers; it offers an admirably clear statement and several acute criticisms of the positions examined.

In Chapter II Professor Baillie deals with the problems of doubt and disbelief. He thinks that there is none who *really* has no belief in God; the belief is there, deep down, only needing to be brought to light. His discussion is most valuable, although one may doubt whether he does not take too hopeful a view of human nature.

Chapter III deals with the first of the three main propositions. The following is a typical passage: "We are rejecting logical argument of any kind . . . as representing the process by which God comes to be known. We are holding that our knowledge of God rests rather on the revelation of His personal Presence as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We are thus directly challenging St Thomas's doctrine that we have no knowledge of God *per se* but only *per ea quæ facta sunt*" (p. 132). Hume and Kant,

Professor Baillie believes, have shown once and for all that the "so-called theistic proofs" are broken reeds. Even the moral argument, to which Kant is so much attached, is of no avail. God is, indeed, present to us in moral experiences, but His existence is not an inference from them.

The second proposition is developed in Chapter IV. We know God directly, and yet always "in, with and under" other persons or things. The immediacy of His presence is a "mediated immediacy." The best analogy to our knowledge of God is our knowledge of other persons. At the same time, God is more intimately present to us than any human person. He is not, as Otto would have it, *wholly* other; He is also within us.

Such is Professor Baillie's central thesis. He defends it with skill and thoroughness; and he claims for it the support not only of many contemporary thinkers, but of the scholastic strain represented by St Anselm and St Bonaventure. I venture to make the following remark upon it. I do not deny that there may be many who have this experience of God's Presence. But I doubt whether the experience is as universal or convincing as Professor Baillie suggests. It cannot be for nothing that such men as Plato, St Thomas, Berkeley thought it worth while to look for proofs of God's existence. Therefore I think it unwise to brush aside entirely the traditional "proofs." Surely the argument from design and the moral argument are not utterly bankrupt. Granted that at best they will give us an "inferred God," is this a reason for dispensing with whatever help they can afford? As Professor Price has said of the remark that we don't want inferred friends, "We may have to put up with them for lack of anything else." I myself could not truthfully say, "I *know* that there is a God," although I could say, "I believe very strongly that there is." The title of Professor Baillie's book is significant; and it is in accord with his central argument. But others have preferred to speak of our *belief* in God. And this, I think, marks an important difference. Only direct confrontation could yield knowledge of God; argument or testimony might produce belief. The fact that so many have chosen to use the terms "belief" and "faith" rather than "knowledge" is a sign that direct confrontation is a much rarer experience than Professor Baillie supposes. Perhaps, indeed, it is given only to the mystic.

This, therefore, is the difficulty which one reader finds in accepting Professor Baillie's position. It is not that he has chosen to argue from the facts of experience—far from it—but rather that he has laid on them a burden greater than they can bear; while at the same time he has sacrificed whatever help is to be gained from the traditional arguments. Besides, as Professor Baillie would no doubt admit, we do not need to rely entirely on our own experience, or on arguments. We have

also the evidence of the Bible and the witness of the Church to confirm our faith.

For a book which covers such a wide field of literature, the number of minor blemishes is very small. One is therefore all the more surprised to find Berkeley described as an " English bishop " (p. 206).

This review has dealt almost entirely with the main argument of the work. Scarcely any mention has been made of the many flank-discussions which the book contains. Professor Baillie has much that is important to say about nature and grace, natural and revealed religion, and the theologies of Luther and Calvin. The close affinity of his thought on many topics with that of such Anglican theologians as Dr Temple and Professor Webb is one of the many interesting features of a sincere and thoughtful work.

E. J. Furlong.

The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By William Leonard. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 12s. 6d.

Dr Leonard, who is Professor of Sacred Scripture at St Patrick's Seminary, Sydney, began his book as a study in the use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and was then in substantial agreement with Origen that " the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the literary expression and composition belong to someone else "; but his study grew into a detailed comparison of Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles, and he finished by finding himself in agreement with the Papal Biblical Commission that there is no sufficient warrant for denying the epistle to Paul. This is the most exhaustive book on the subject that has appeared in recent years, and though the author brings the discussion to bear throughout upon the technical problem of authorship he is concerned not only with this, and he marshals a great deal of linguistic and exegetical material which is of value quite apart from his main thesis. It is a pity, however, that such a massive work should be written in a ponderous style and should include some distressing jargon. (Must we call the Holy of Holies " the sacred Cube of the Israelite sanctuary " ?)

Hebrews and the Pauline corpus (which for the writer includes the Pastorals) are compared under various heads. In theology no essential difference is discerned between them, and the christology and soteriology of Hebrews, though elaborated in the more hieratic and liturgical form dictated by its special theme, require the whole Pauline theology to explain them. The Pauline epistles are ransacked for parallels to the special characteristics of phraseology, style and grammar in Hebrews, the hapax-legomena are reduced by careful scrutiny, and what still remains over to be explained is ascribed to the hand of Paul's amanuensis. The author of Hebrews is shown to have

had the same preferences as Paul for certain passages of the Old Testament; to have cited Scripture as a Palestinian like Paul and not, as some scholars have maintained, as an Alexandrian like Philo; to have used a text of the LXX which, like that of Paul, varied between the A and B texts and was sometimes independent of either; and to have used a typological method of exegesis which was required by his subject but which was also used by Paul. The conclusion is that there is no justification for deleting the title "The Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews."

It is both sound doctrine and sound sense to hold to the Church's tradition about the authorship of the New Testament writings unless it is proved to be quite untenable, but in the case of Hebrews there is no such starting-point. The Church's tradition of Pauline authorship was not established until the fourth century, and has been questioned by Catholic and non-Catholic scholars since the sixteenth. It is something which still remains to be demonstrated rather than to be accepted until disproved, and the difficulty for anyone who tries to prove it is that so many points have to be specially pleaded. It is doubtful whether even Dr Leonard's monumental work does anything more than to show the essential unity of the biblical message in the hands of two different writers. The theology of Hebrews is in harmony with that of Paul, though the attention paid to the human life of Jesus is un-Pauline, and it is hardly adequate to say that "the notion of faith in Hebrews differs in nothing from the Pauline notion except in such shades of colour and emphasis of aspect as are demanded by a new theme adapted to a special occasion." But then so is the theology of the Fourth Gospel in harmony with St Paul, but St John did write in terms of the Logos and St. Paul did not. Have we any grounds for believing that St Paul wrote authoritatively to expound Christianity in terms of "sacrifice" and "priesthood"? Not unless the evidence is strongly in favour of it, and this it is not. The un-Pauline reference of the author of Hebrews to himself in ii, 3 is not dealt with, and the linguistic evidence, which might decide the issue, is just the weak point. Once grant an amanuensis to account for the differences of language, and Paul's relation to the epistle becomes more and more shadowy. If the frequent use of the genitive absolute betrays the hand of an amanuensis, may not the other literary elegances of the epistle come from the same source and the fact that they can be paralleled here and there in Paul be quite fortuitous? Indeed the linguistic evidence alone could be used to establish quite as convincing a connexion between Hebrews and the Lukan writings or 1 Peter.

C. F. Evans.

THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST AS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. Friedrich Jurgensmeier. G. Coldwell, Ltd. 12s.

Recent theology, both Roman and Anglican, has shown an increasing tendency to emphasize the cardinal importance and supernatural character of the Church, and incorporation in this supernatural Church as the necessary condition of man's growth in the spiritual life. The deep Pauline conception of the "Mystical Body" has again become prominent in Christian apologetic, perhaps in accordance with the general revolt from nineteenth-century individualism and the intense social preoccupations of our time. This restoration of emphasis on the corporate and organic aspect of Christianity and its institutional expression was badly needed. But, as usual in such cases, there are already signs that it has overstepped its limit, has set up a fatal either-or between individual and liturgical worship, and encouraged a tendency to subordinate the personal life of prayer and personal religious experience to the total action of the Church. To this excess Dr Jurgensmeier's treatise will be a valuable corrective, for his theme is the close interdependence of the personal spiritual life in man and the suprapersonal life of the mystical body, and hence of "liturgical" and "private" piety. Both are needed if Christianity is to achieve full development, for the objective worship and creative power of the Church depend for their vigour and realism on the spiritual vitality, the "ascetical endeavours" of the individual souls composing that Church.

> As the life of the Mystical Body is not only upheld by the community of the faithful but also by each individual, *its piety must be manifested, of inner necessity, both communally and individually.* This individual piety—whether it be that which is formed and fostered by liturgy, or that which is sufficient of itself, developing irrespective of liturgy—is shown to be not only possible but necessary. . . . Through the very fact of membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, the member is given the right to individualize his life and activity.

The essence of the spiritual or ascetic life in man is the "endeavour to attain perfection"; and Christian perfection, says St Thomas, consists in charity, or loving conformity with the nature of God. But this perfection can only be attained by human nature in so far as it is incorporated in the Mystical Body—"Christ plus the whole company of the faithful"—and shares in those supernatural graces which circulate in the Body and continue in time the work of the Incarnation. The close connexion of this organic doctrine of the Christian life with the sacramental system, and especially the Eucharist, is obvious. The object of God's economy of salvation is the "restoration of all things in Christ." As Christ offered Himself in person and without conditions to God, so human nature attains its

true end when dedicated as part of His Mystical Body, which is the enduring organ of His action on earth. The Eucharist is the characteristic act of this Mystical Body, the common sacrifice of Christ and all believers, who are co-offerers with Him. "The Eucharist is fully acceptable to God only when it is offered up as the co-sacrifice of Christ and His members in one fellowship, and is directed towards the unique goal of all ascetic endeavour, the glorification of God."

This short notice only touches on a few points in a closely knit and elaborate argument. The book, which has been built up from instructions given to theological students, is not altogether easy reading; but priests and others called upon to give religious teaching will find it full of valuable and suggestive material. Its outstanding quality is the inclusiveness and organic sense which maintains the difficult balance between the liturgic and personal, corporate and individual aspects of religious life. According to Dr Jurgensmeier the doctrine of the Mystical Body is the necessary basis of the whole practice of Christian asceticism, and its great value is shown to consist "first of all in the influence it exerts upon the individual member, showing him the way to participate most profitably in liturgy; secondly, through liturgy, it fructifies the ascetic life of the individual, who is thus enabled to mould his life more and more on the pattern of Christ's life."

Only where liturgical revival rests on some such foundation as this, and presupposes a deep sense of spiritual unity in all taking part in it, can we expect it to exhibit its life-changing power.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

RICHARD BAXTER, THE REFORMED PASTOR. Edited by John T. Wilkinson. The Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

Richard Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* was first published in 1656. Mr Wilkinson has done well to make this religious classic accessible in an attractive form with a satisfying introduction. Baxter's book is a monument of a wonderful and fruitful ministry, a ministry of most self-denying labours. Kidderminster responded well to the appeal of its devoted pastor. "When I came thither first," he wrote, "there was about one family in a street that worshipped God and called on His name, and when I came away there were some streets where there was not past one family in the side of a street that did not so, and that did not, by professing serious godliness, give us hopes of their sincerity."

Baxter knows well the human heart. Pride is the root of most sins, and is one of the "most heinous and palpable."

Among the pastors of Christ's flock "it is more hateful and inexcusable" than in anyone else. "Brethren, may I take leave a little," he urged his fellow-pastors, "to expostulate this case with my own heart and you, that we may see the shame of our sin and be reformed? . . . Humility is not a mere ornament of a Christian, but an essential part of the new creature; it is a contradiction to be a sanctified man or a true Christian and not humble." He sees only too plainly how the lack of humility can ruin the spiritual work of the minister of Christ. Baxter is also distressed at the worldliness of his ministerial brethren. "Another sad discovery that we have not so devoted ourselves, and all that we have, to the service of God, is *the prevalence of worldly interests too much against the interest and the work of Christ.* And this I shall further manifest in these three instances following—our temporizing; our too much minding worldly things, and shrinking from the duties that will hinder our commodity; our barrenness in works of charity and in the improving of all we have to our Master's use. . . . It occasioneth the enemies to say that reputation and preferment is our religion and our reward. . . . I find money is too strong an argument for some men to answer." Baxter knows too that, to a great extent, upon the holiness of the pastor will depend, with God's grace, the success of the work undertaken in His name. "O brethren, watch therefore over your own hearts . . . be much at home: and take heed to yourselves also, because there are many eyes upon you, and therefore there will be many observers of your falls. You cannot miscarry but the world will ring of it. The eclipses of the sun by daytime are seldom without witnesses . . . your sins have more heinous aggravations than other men's. . . . O, take heed, brethren, in the name of God, of every word that you speak, every step that you tread, for you bear the Ark of the Lord; you are intrusted with His honour, and dare not let it fall, and cast it into the dirt."

It is surprising to learn that Baxter urges the duty of ministerial celibacy that ministers "might live in a single, freer condition, and have none of the temptations from wife and children to hinder them from furthering their ministerial ends by charitable works." Mr Wilkinson gives no outline of Baxter's life, and therefore has no space to tell us how this ideal of ministerial celibacy was abandoned with the pastor's marriage with Margaret Charlton, he being aged forty-seven and she aged nineteen. Margaret died in 1681. In that year he wrote her Life. Margaret was a devoted wife, and followed her husband to prison when he was sent thither for preaching. "She cheerfully went with me into prison," he wrote; "she brought her best bed thither; and did much to remove the removable inconveniences of the prison. I think she had scarce ever a pleasanter time in her life than when she was with me there." Yet both had their difficulties: she that with his increasing deafness and ill-health he was

tempted to slacken in his efforts at preaching and teaching, and he that in her boundless generosity she insisted on borrowing money for charitable purposes.

We hope that in Mr Wilkinson's second edition there will be an index to the book.

R. D. Middleton.

Judaism and Christianity. Essays presented to the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff, D.D. Edited by L. Gillet. J. B. Shears and Sons. 3s. 6d.

A symposium of essays collected to mark Dr Levertoff's sixtieth anniversary, this book is a worthy tribute to his untiring work in the sphere of Jewish-Christian relations. Two of the essays, those of the late Bishop Frere and the late Professor Goudge, have already appeared in print in *The Church and the Jews*, the quarterly organ of Dr Levertoff's work, and they both consider in general the problem of the relation between Judaism and Christianity. The other essays are concerned for the most part with more particular questions. Dr Oesterley contributes an appreciation of the Jewish liturgy, drawing attention to some of its fundamental elements. Dr Greenup examines the Day of Atonement as it is dealt with in Philo, Josephus, the New Testament and post-Mishnaic times, concluding with the expression of the hope that modern reform movements in Judaism may lead to the realization that "Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." In relation to the study of the Atonement, Mr Harley Walker notes the Jewish background of the Christian doctrine of salvation and compares and contrasts Judæo-Christian soteriological thought, especially with regard to the "Goel" idea, with Indian soteriological thought as seen in the conception of Karma. The editor, Fr Gillet, writing in French, raises the question of the Shekinah and its significance in Christology, a subject upon which Dr Levertoff has long been engaged in preparing a book. It is a pity that here, as elsewhere in the book, there are many small errors in the printing of the Greek quotations.

The interest and value of the book are greatly enhanced by the inclusion of a Latin version of Dr Levertoff's Jewish-Christian liturgy, "The Meal of the Holy King." This is subjected to a careful explanation and consideration by Lic. Paul Schorlemmer, who writes in German. Mr W. A. Walker, in considering the problem of a Jewish-Christian branch of the Catholic Church, indicates the obstacle caused by Christian disunity, but stresses the importance of Jewish converts becoming full members of the Body of Christ, the Church. In the concluding pages Dr Levertoff's daughter contributes a very illuminating bio-

graphical sketch of her father, tracing his growth from truly Jewish stock to the point at which, aged eighteen, he became a Christian. From that time Dr Levertoff has consistently sought to reconcile Church and Synagogue, Jew and Gentile, and it is to this lofty aim and to the measure of success already achieved that this volume bears respectful testimony. A short bibliography of Dr Levertoff's published works is appended.

C. Witton-Davies.

The Descent of the Dove. By Charles Williams. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

We are familiar with Outlines of History which, whether avowedly materialistic or not, yet *ex hypothesi* exclude divine intervention. Even Church Histories are generally written on the same plan; they deal with the human side of events, even if the writers are themselves Christians. But suppose one should attempt to write a History of the Holy Ghost, meaning by that not a record of what men have thought about the Holy Ghost but, literally, what the Lord and Lifegiving Spirit has done in the Church in which He dwells? The ideally successful book could, we should guess, at best be a magnificent failure. Well, without saying that Mr Williams' book is the ideal one, it is a failure, and it is magnificent. It has been left to a layman, a poet, earning his living in a business house, to write a history of the Church from the point of view of God.

Candour bids the reviewer say that in some this book will arouse exasperation; but he at least read it with admiration working up to a glow of excitement. The author gets into his stride with Dante, after whom the illumination is bright indeed. Two examples of his point of view may be quoted. "Our Lord the Spirit, having permitted contrition to exist, permitted sheer intelligence to exist; he inspired—one may say so—Montaigne" (p. 191). After discussing the triumphs of dogmatic Communism: "Whatever comes can be but a war of frontiers. The Centre cannot be touched; all that can possibly be done there has been done, outside Jerusalem, under Tiberius" (p. 231).

Some memorable sentences may be quoted: "The weaker brethren, those innocent sheep who by mere volume of imbecility have trampled over many delicate and attractive flowers in Christendom." "There is no other institution which suffers from time so much as religion. At the moment when it is remotely possible that a whole generation might have learned something both of theory and practice, the learners and their learning are removed by death, and the Church is confronted with the necessity of beginning all over again." Of Beatrice: "the chief of those few girls who out of all the millions have been caught up by holy Luck into the fame of verse and the everlasting glory of spirit."

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

God in History. By Otto Piper. Macmillan. 9s.

This book is based on the Croall Lectures given at Edinburgh in 1936. It surveys history from a bold and thorough conviction of biblical religion; " in biblical religion alone is the significance of history profoundly understood and its nature satisfactorily explained." Thus it challenges a great deal of nineteenth-century and contemporary thought. It was Hegel who " blinded many of the ablest scholars to the true significance of holy history." These men, T. H. Green and Harnack among them, regarded the events of holy history, including the nativity and crucifixion, as merely illustrations of the divine mind. The next lot of scholars, like Bousset and Gunkel, began to destroy the very notion of history. The more they saw of it the less they liked it; it was a waste field of the contingent and relative. And so Christian belief thinned down into anæmic streams of morality and emotion away from the strong blood of history. There are now some new reactions, but Barth, however sound his reaction, stresses revelation at the expense of history. Berdyaev speculates a theosophy at the joint expense of them both.

Professor Piper himself follows and develops the school of holy history, *Heilsgeschichte*, which flourished in southern Germany from about 1750 to 1850. His survey begins by examining the end of the " Old Aeon," with its " fatal tensions " and yet with its fulness of time within which the plenitude of Christ could be revealed. In the realm of thought, it is argued that Jesus resolved the conflict between subjective humanism and Jewish dogma. " He confirmed the Greek belief that man is the measure of all things, but He made clear at the same time that He alone was the veritable man." He, in fact, founded the true *philosophia perennis* which has charged all the most powerful, yet still broken, lights of his followers, whether Origen, Aquinas or Calvin. Then come chapters on the divine purpose and God's way in and through history. The created world is good but the historical world has become corrupt. The corruption can only be explained by distinguishing original history (*Urgeschichte*) and pre-history. The fall of Adam took place in pre-history, and in a spiritual world which, " while existing in time, is not subject to the laws of historical time." There have followed the two lines of God's activity, in secular and holy history, in general and special revelations. The rest of the book traces this double activity in the achievement and failure of Israel and in the work of the Christian Church. In face of the rationalist historian it demonstrates the miraculous growth of this Church, and the unique power by which Christian truth relates its secular and holy spheres of action. " Western civilization is based on the indefatigable activity of the Church."

This is both a thorough and a bold book; thorough in its threefold grasp of theology, history and philosophy, bold in

its simple assertion of a biblical view. There is something of that stimulating simplicity which we get in less orthodox fashion from Professor Macmurray. In face of all naturalistic scepticism, outside or in the Church, the earth definitely is the Lord's and its history too.

I would, however, criticize the author's method and expression for not being simple enough. He passes from the language of evangelical fervour to that of academic philosophy and back again. This is confusing. Like Wyclif against the scholastics, he fights his opponents too much with their own weapons of arid jargon, and he does not integrate his range of learning into a personal statement. This is largely due, I feel, to the self-imposed terms of reference: "It is not my purpose to offer a philosophy or theology of history." Yet without some such philosophy a statement of the biblical view appears somewhat bleak and falsely abstracted. It lacks the natural and vividly concrete conviction of H. G. Wood's Hulsean Lectures, *Christianity and the Nature of History*. I also suggest that any English survey of history from the Christian point of view ought to reckon with those two contemporary workers in the field, A. J. Toynbee and Macmurray, who have most challenged ordinary thinkers. But it is very easy to criticize the scope of a book, and in this instance Professor Piper is no shirker, for he intends shortly to publish a work dealing directly with the elements and laws of history.

E. W. Edmonds.

SHORTER NOTICES

Roger Bacon. A Biography. By F. Winthrop Woodruff. James Clarke. 5s.

That Roger Bacon, whose life covered most of the thirteenth century, deserves an honoured place among the pioneers of the scientific spirit is certain. If he believed in astrology, this was for him a branch of astronomy, and here as elsewhere experiment was the ultimate test. His interests extended widely—*e.g.*, to the reform of the Julian calendar. He believed that the earth was round. He may have invented a telescope; he certainly knew that lenses might be used as aids to vision. In a different field, he pressed for a more accurate text of the Vulgate; for he never imagined that experimental science could take the place of religion. Mr Woodruff's popular biography serves a useful purpose in making the Franciscan friar, who almost inevitably was condemned and imprisoned *propter novitates*, a less purely legendary figure. Extracts from his voluminous writings are given in English.

F. E. Barker.

HERMAN LEONARD PASS: A MEMOIR. By Charles Scott Gillett. Mowbray. N.p.

The many friends of the late Canon Pass will be delighted to possess this charming account of his life and work by his successor at Chichester Theological College. His love of souls and his learning, as well as the amiable eccentricities which amused him quite as much as they amused those who knew him, are all brought out in their right proportions. The result is an extremely lifelike portrait of an extremely interesting and delightful personality.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

PLAYS FROM ST. HILARY. By Bernard Walke. Faber. 2s. 6d.

The name of Bernard Walke is known to a wide audience of radio listeners as the author and producer of religious plays which manage to send a glow of religious devotion even over the air. He has now collected these little plays and put them into a volume. It must be admitted that they lack the technical "finish" of, say, the Little St Francis Plays of Mr Laurence Housman, and the cold light of print is not the best interpreter of the dim mystery that gained in substance from its nebulous background; but the appeal of these plays is undeniable even so. They seem to have preserved something of the medieval spirit so unhappily absent from most modern religious drama.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

CENTENARY PRESS: C. J. Shebbeare, *Christianity and Other Religions* (3s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: *The Christian Virtues and the War*, 4 to 7 (2d. each); *A Service of Prayer for Use in War-time* (1d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Leslie F. Church, *Before God's Throne* (3s. 6d.); *Hymns for the Times* (2d.).

GOLLANCZ: Leonard Woolf, *Barbarians at the Gate* (6s.).

LONGMANS: *Per Christum Vinces* (6d.).

MOWBRAYS: L. Hodgson, *This War and the Christian* (1s. 6d.).

NAROD PRESS: "Ivrith," *The Jewish Character* (2s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS BOOK CLUB: D. R. Davies, *On to Orthodoxy* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: E. H. Fellowes, *The Knights of the Garter, 1348-1939; Organists and Masters of the Choristers of St George's Chapel in Windsor Castle* (6s. each); E. A. Jones, *The Plate of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle* (5s.). W. Perry, *Alexander Penrose Forbes, The Scottish Pusey* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: *Venite* (1s.); F. J. Shirley, *Canterbury Prayer Book* (2s.); Bishop of Ely, *A Five Years' Plan of Teaching* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher